

The JOURNAL of
SOUTHERN
HISTORY

VOL. XI

AUGUST, 1945

No. 3



Published quarterly by the
SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME XI

AUGUST, 1945

NUMBER 3

Published Quarterly by
THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION



BOARD OF EDITORS

FLETCHER M. GREEN
University of North Carolina

WESLEY F. CRAVEN
New York University

RUDOLPH L. BIESELE
University of Texas

THOMAS D. CLARK
University of Kentucky

BELL I. WILEY
University of Mississippi

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON
Louisiana State University

BERNARD MAYO
University of Virginia

KATHRYN ABBEY HANNA
Rollins College

MANAGING EDITOR

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY, Vanderbilt University

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATE

NORA C. CHAFFIN, Vanderbilt University

GUARANTOR

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY



Correspondence in regard to contributions to the *Journal* should be sent to the Managing Editor, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee.

The Southern Historical Association supplies the *Journal* to its members. The annual membership fee is three dollars; upon payment of fifty dollars, any person may become a life member. Single numbers of the *Journal* are available at seventy-five cents. Membership application and checks should be sent to James W. Patton, Secretary-Treasurer, North Carolina State College, Raleigh, North Carolina.

The Southern Historical Association disclaims responsibility for statements made by contributors.

Entered as second-class matter April 5, 1935, at the Post Office at University Station, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Additional entry at Nashville, Tennessee.

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME XI

AUGUST, 1945

NUMBER 3



Copyright, 1945, by the Southern Historical Association

CONTENTS

<i>Lincoln and the Strategy of Defense in the Crisis of 1861.</i> By Kenneth M. Stampp	297
<i>The Civil War Career of Charles Wilkes.</i> By William W. Jeffries	324
<i>The Louisiana Unification Movement of 1873.</i> By T. Harry Williams	349
<i>Plantation Architecture of the Lower South on the Eve of the Civil War.</i> By James C. Bonner	370
 <i>Notes and Documents</i>	
The Advent of William Gregg and the Graniteville Company. Edited by Thomas P. Martin	389
Some Addenda to "Walter Lynwood Fleming: Historian of Reconstruction." By Fletcher M. Green	424
 <i>Book Reviews</i>	
Lonn, <i>The Colonial Agents of the Southern Colonies</i> , by Philip Davidson	426
Niles, <i>The James, from Iron Gate to the Sea</i> , by Robert L. Hildrup	427
Monaghan, <i>Lincoln Bibliography, 1839-1939</i> , Volumes I and II, by T. Harry Williams	429
Baringer, <i>A House Dividing: Lincoln as President Elect</i> , by Howard C. Per- kins	431
Reynolds, <i>The Coosa River Valley from De Soto to Hydroelectric Power</i> , by Henry L. Swint	434
Norris, <i>Fighting Liberal: The Autobiography of George W. Norris</i> , by Stan- ley J. Folmsbee	434
Callcott, <i>South Carolina: Economic and Social</i> , by John V. Van Sickle	436
 <i>Historical News and Notices</i>	
Personal	438
Historical Societies	440
Bibliographical	442
 <i>Contributors</i>	452

Lincoln and the Strategy of Defense in the Crisis of 1861

BY KENNETH M. STAMPP

"Lincoln never poured out his soul to any mortal creature at any time. . . . He was the most secretive—reticent—shut-mouthed man that ever existed."¹ This, the studied opinion of William H. Herndon who knew his subject as well as any contemporary, defined the perplexing quality in the character of Abraham Lincoln which caused him to be assigned to the trite category of enigmas. This is why his acts frequently permit antithetical explanations; perhaps too why forthright motives often appear devious. Through the unwarranted assumption that "shut-mouthed" men are necessarily complex, his reticence always seemed to belie his self-professed simplicity.

As President-elect during the months of the secession crisis, Lincoln kept his own counsel even more completely than usual. The confessions of close associates like Herndon and Judge David Davis that they knew nothing of his plans² gave partial validity to the remark of a newspaper correspondent that "Mr. Lincoln keeps all people, his friends included, in the dark. . . . Mr. Lincoln promises nothing, but only listens."³ Hence it is not difficult to understand why the available evidence could at the same time fortify the conclusion that Lincoln deliberately maneuvered the Confederates into firing upon Fort Sumter to save his party from disintegration,⁴ and, conversely, bolster the

¹ Paul M. Angle (ed.), *Herndon's Life of Lincoln* (New York, 1930), xxxix.

² *Ibid.*, 387, 408. Herndon quoted Davis as saying in 1866: "I know it was the general impression in Washington that I knew all about Lincoln's plans and ideas, but the truth is, I knew nothing. He never confided to me anything of his purposes."

³ *New York Herald*, February 27, 1861.

⁴ Charles W. Ramsdell, "Lincoln and Fort Sumter," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), III (1937), 259-88; John S. Tilley, *Lincoln Takes Command* (Chapel Hill, 1941).

contention that the Sumter episode was precisely what Lincoln hoped to avoid—that it was in effect a defeat for his whole policy.⁵ The same scanty evidence, however, suggests still another interpretation.

Happily the President-elect left the record unmistakably clear on two points. First, there can be no doubt that Lincoln was an intense nationalist and that he regarded the Union as indestructible. Having sprung from the party of Webster and Clay, he repeatedly expressed pride in his political origins⁶ and scoffed at the dogmas of the state rights school. In his inaugural address Lincoln took pains to prove that "the Union of these States is perpetual." While he added little to the classical nationalist argument, he showed that the thought of acquiescing in disunion never entered his mind:

It follows from these views that no State upon its own mere motion can lawfully get out of the Union; that resolves and ordinances to that effect are legally void; and that acts of violence, within any State or States, against the authority of the United States, are insurrectionary or revolutionary, according to circumstances.

I therefore consider that, in view of the Constitution and the laws, the Union is unbroken.⁷

At the same time, through private and confidential letters to political friends in Congress, Lincoln expressed inflexible opposition to any compromise on the issue of slavery expansion. His past speeches, he contended, made it clear that he assumed no right to interfere with slavery where it existed, that he had no desire to menace the rights of the South, and that he would enforce the fugitive slave law.⁸ But

⁵ James G. Randall, "When War Came in 1861," in *Abraham Lincoln Quarterly* (Springfield, 1940-), I (1940), 3-42; David M. Potter, *Lincoln and His Party in the Secession Crisis* (New Haven, 1942).

⁶ See, for example, Lincoln's speech at Ottawa, Illinois, during his debates with Douglas in 1858, in John G. Nicolay and John Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, 12 vols. (New York, 1905), III, 223-57. One of Lincoln's biographers contends that part of his dislike of the abolitionists arose from their lack of national feeling. Nathaniel W. Stephenson, *Lincoln; An Account of His Personal Life* (Indianapolis, 1922), 142-43, 145.

⁷ Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 169-85. See also Lincoln's reply to the mayor of New York, February 20, 1861, *ibid.*, VI, 149-50; John G. Nicolay and John Hay, *Abraham Lincoln: A History*, 10 vols. (New York, 1890), III, 247-48.

⁸ Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 63-64, 66-67, 68-69, 70-71, 74-75, 79-82, 85-86, 87-89, 119-21. On February 1 Lincoln wrote Seward of his intention

concerning slavery in the territories he cautioned his friends to "hold firm, as with a chain of steel."⁹

Any explanation of Lincoln's opposition to compromise must be speculative, for his words are subject to varying interpretations. He objected to the restoration of the Missouri Compromise line with the assertion that this would settle nothing, that it would simply stimulate "filibustering for all South of us and making slave States of it."¹⁰ Simultaneously he expressed a distaste for the personal humiliation involved in proposals to "buy or beg a peaceful inauguration" through concessions.¹¹ Considerations of prestige and "face-saving" clearly were involved. Lincoln may also have decided that the time had come for a final settlement of the questions of secession and slavery expansion. "The tug has to come," he wrote to Senator Lyman Trumbull, "& better now than any time hereafter."¹² If this was the case, Lincoln expressed an opinion widely held among his Republican contemporaries. "If we must have civil war," wrote Edward Bates, "perhaps it is better now than at a future date."¹³ A western Republican paper asserted that "we are heartily tired of having this [secession] threat stare us in the face evermore. . . . We never have been better prepared

to protect the rights of the South, and even hinted that he might accept the admission of New Mexico as a slave state. "As to fugitive slaves, District of Columbia, slave-trade among the slave States, and whatever springs of necessity from the fact that the institution is amongst us, I care but little, so that what is done be comely and not altogether outrageous. Nor do I care much about New Mexico, if further extension were hedged against." *Ibid.*, VI, 102-104.

⁹ *Ibid.*, VI, 77-78, 78-79, 82, 93-94, 102-104; Gilbert A. Tracy (ed.), *Uncollected Letters of Abraham Lincoln* (Boston, 1917), 171.

¹⁰ Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 78-79, 82; Emanuel Hertz, *Abraham Lincoln; A New Portrait*, 2 vols. (New York, 1931), II, 795.

¹¹ Horace White, *Life of Lyman Trumbull* (New York, 1913), 111. During the month of February the New York *Tribune* headed its editorial columns with an alleged statement of Lincoln to Dr. C. H. Ray of the Chicago *Tribune*: "I will suffer death before I will consent to any concession or compromise which looks like buying the privilege of taking possession of the Government to which we have a constitutional right."

¹² Lincoln to Trumbull, December 10, 1860, in Tracy (ed.), *Uncollected Letters of Lincoln*, 171. See also, Lincoln to William Kellogg, December 11, 1860, in Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 77-78; Lincoln to J. T. Hale, January 11, 1861, *ibid.*, VI, 93-94.

¹³ Howard K. Beale (ed.), *The Diary of Edward Bates, 1859-1866*, in American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1930, IV (Washington, 1933), 157-58.

for such a crisis than now. We most ardently desire that it may come."¹⁴ Indeed, throughout the secession crisis, it is remarkable how often Lincoln shared, or merely reflected, popular views.

In these same letters the President-elect made intriguingly vague remarks to the effect that as soon as compromise was accepted, "they have us under again: all our labor is lost, and sooner or later must be done over."¹⁵ Compromise "would lose us everything we gain by the election," he added, and it would be "the end of us."¹⁶ Here, perhaps, Lincoln indicated primary concern for the well-being of the Republican party and a fear that compromise would mean its ruin.¹⁷ Certainly his party friends and advisers were acutely aware that concession would menace their organization and that the radical wing might bolt the new administration. Ever before them was the fate of the Whig party, which, one Republican insisted, had "died of compromises."¹⁸ Thurlow Weed, on a visit to Washington, found the Republicans overwhelmed by this fear.¹⁹ Open the territories to slavery, admonished one of the faithful, and "Republicanism is a 'dead dog.'"²⁰

¹⁴ Indianapolis *Indiana American*, November 21, 1860. For similar views see Centreville *Indiana True Republican*, January 31, 1861; New York *Courier and Enquirer*, November 2, 5, 6, 1860; New York *Tribune*, December 19, 20, 1860; January 4, 1861; Conneautville (Penn.) *Record*, quoted in New York *Tribune*, February 19, 1861; Worcester *Spy*, December 4, 1860; Boston *Daily Advertiser*, December 20, 1860; Charles R. Williams (ed.), *Diary and Letters of Rutherford Birchard Hayes*, 4 vols. (Columbus, 1922-1925), I, 566; Trumbull to E. C. Larned, January 16, 1861, in White, *Life of Lyman Trumbull*, 113-14.

¹⁵ Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 77-79; Tracy (ed.), *Uncollected Letters of Lincoln*, 171; Stephenson, *Lincoln*, 114-15.

¹⁶ Lincoln to Thurlow Weed, December 17, 1860, in Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 82.

¹⁷ In a speech delivered in Kansas in December, 1859, Lincoln insisted that to yield on the issue of slavery expansion would wreck the party: "Simultaneously with such letting down the Republican organization would go to pieces, and half its elements would go in a different direction, leaving an easy victory to the common enemy." *Ibid.*, V, 274-75.

¹⁸ Letter of "J. W." in Worcester *Spy*, December 29, 1860.

¹⁹ Thurlow Weed Barnes (ed.), *Memoir of Thurlow Weed* (Boston, 1884), 312-13.

²⁰ Indianapolis *Daily Journal*, December 25, 1860. See also, Boston Correspondence in New York *Evening Post*, January 11, 1861; New York *Herald*, November 24, 1860; January 12, 1861; Washington Correspondence in New York *Courier and Enquirer*, January 10, 1861; New York *Tribune*, November 29, 1860; January 26, February 8, 14, 1861; Burlington (Vt.) *Times*, quoted in New York *Tribune*, February 16, 1861; Th. Heilscher to George W. Julian, November 30, 1860, in George W. Julian Papers (Indiana State

Yet the fact remains that there was little in these sentiments to invalidate the possibility that Lincoln, in opposing compromise, was thinking less of party than of what he regarded as the best interests of the North, perhaps of the whole nation. More likely the two concepts were fused in Lincoln's mind. Professional politicians have a happy facility for identifying personal and party interests with broad national interests, and Lincoln may have believed sincerely that what helped the Republican party would help everyone.

Having flatly rejected both compromise and acquiescence in disunion, Lincoln could have hoped to solve the secession crisis in only two other ways. Either loyal Southerners might have been encouraged to overthrow the secessionists, voluntarily to renew their allegiance to the federal government, and thus to secure a peaceful reconstruction of the Union,²¹ or Lincoln might have used force to protect federal property and maintain national authority in the South. In other words, the secessionists could have been coerced, defining coercion broadly as any attempt to enforce federal laws against the wishes of state authorities or large bodies of disaffected citizens.

Probably Lincoln regarded neither the device of peaceful reconstruction nor coercion as a basic policy. These were mere stratagems to be used according to circumstances. From the viewpoint of practical statesmanship the preservation of peace or the launching of war are never the supreme objects of policy. They are means to an end; the more fundamental aim is to preserve, defend, and advance primary national interests. Such interests are guarded by peaceful means when

Library, Indianapolis); Trumbull to Lincoln, December 4, 1860, in Nicolay and Hay, *Lincoln*, III, 254.

²¹ This plan was discussed considerably in the northern press, especially in the early weeks when there was a tendency to treat the crisis lightly. See, for example, *Boston Daily Evening Traveller*, November 10, 12, 19, 1860; *Boston Journal*, November 10, 12, 19, 1860; *Boston Evening Transcript*, November 13, 1860; *Boston Daily Advertiser*, November 12, 17, 22, December 3, 1860. The idea was still being advanced by the Springfield (Mass.) *Republican* as late as February 26, 28, and March 23. The New York *Tribune* presented the plan, but did not endorse it, on March 27. The Washington Correspondent of the *Boston Daily Advertiser*, December 10, 1860, asserted that peaceful reconstruction was Seward's basic formula. See also, Potter, *Lincoln and His Party in the Secession Crisis*, 219 ff.

possible, but the use of force is never ruled out as a last resort. "National defense" has ever been a prime concern of the statesmen.

When Lincoln's problem is placed in this context his words and acts during the secession crisis take on a semblance of rational consistency. Because the President-elect opposed compromise and peaceful secession it does not follow that his basic purpose was either peace or war. Rather, his chief concern was the maintenance of the Union, a national interest which he regarded as vital enough to have precedence over all other considerations. And the integrity of the Union continued to be his paramount objective throughout the ensuing conflict.²² There is no reason to doubt that Lincoln would have accepted peaceful and voluntary reconstruction as a satisfactory solution within the time limits fixed by expediency.²³ But there is abundant evidence that the possible necessity of coercion entered Lincoln's calculations as soon as he understood the seriousness of the crisis.²⁴ Lincoln was not a pacifist,²⁵ and, as a practical statesman, he looked upon disunion as sufficiently menacing to northern interests to justify resistance by force if necessary.

"The most distinctive element of Mr. Lincoln's moral composition," wrote Henry Villard, the shrewd and observant correspondent of the New York *Herald*, "is his keen sense and comprehensive consciousness of duty. Upon taking his oath of office he will not be guided so much by his party predilections as by the federal constitution and laws. . . . That he will endeavor to fulfill the obligations thus imposed upon him faithfully and fearlessly may be expected with the utmost certainty."²⁶ Making due allowances for inconsistencies and spells of irresolution,

²² See, for example, Lincoln's reply to Horace Greeley's "Prayer of Twenty Millions," in Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VIII, 15-16.

²³ For the evidence that this was Lincoln's formula for saving the Union, see Potter, *Lincoln and His Party in the Secession Crisis*, 219 ff.

²⁴ Herndon noted that in November Lincoln, like most of the northern people, was reluctant to believe that the South was in earnest. This attitude soon changed, and before his departure for Washington, "Mr. Lincoln had on several occasions referred in my presence to the gravity of the national questions that stared him in the face." Angle (ed.), *Herndon's Lincoln*, 382, 408.

²⁵ Apparently another reason for Lincoln's hostility to the abolitionists was the pacifism which pervaded their ranks. Stephenson, *Lincoln*, 142-43.

²⁶ New York *Herald*, February 1, 1861.

Villard was essentially correct in his surmise that Lincoln was strongly impressed with his obligation to "enforce the laws" under all conditions, and whatever the consequences. "I see the duty devolving upon me," he told a friend in early January, adding bitterly that he was "in the garden of Gethsemane now."²⁷ Lincoln was perhaps as frank and blunt on this point before his inauguration as he could have been under the circumstances. Certainly he had no desire to provoke a conflict before the fourth of March; the peaceful organization of his administration was essential before decisive action could be taken.

Nevertheless, it requires no unwarranted assumptions or tortured meanings to read coercion implications into Lincoln's public and private utterances before his inaugural address. On December 13 John G. Nicolay recorded Lincoln's current views on the matter: "The very existence of a general and national government implies the legal power, right, and duty of maintaining its own integrity. . . . It is the duty of the President to execute the laws and maintain the existing government."²⁸ One of the earliest acts of the President-elect was to establish contact with General Winfield Scott, whom he urged "to be as well prepared as he can to either hold or retake the forts, as the case may require, at and after the inauguration."²⁹ At least twice Lincoln assured friends that if the southern forts were occupied by secessionists, "my judgement is that they are to be retaken."³⁰ The resolutions adopted by the Illinois legislature, demanding the preservation of the Union and pledging "the whole resources of the State . . . to the Federal authorities," were drawn by Lincoln's own hand.³¹ His response to the request

²⁷ Interview with Judge Gillespie, in Ida M. Tarbell, *Life of Abraham Lincoln*, 4 vols. (New York, 1900), I, 405-407. For biographers of Lincoln who concluded that he contemplated coercion from the start, see *ibid.*, I, 395-97, and Stephenson, *Lincoln*, 145.

²⁸ John G. Nicolay Personal Memorandum, in Nicolay and Hay, *Lincoln*, III, 247-48. See also, Lincoln to Weed, December 17, 1860, in Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 82.

²⁹ Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 84-85. See also, Nicolay and Hay, *Lincoln*, III, 249-51.

³⁰ Lincoln to Major David Hunter, December 22, 1860, in Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 86; Lincoln to Trumbull, December 24, 1860, in Tracy (ed.), *Uncollected Letters of Lincoln*, 173.

³¹ Hertz, *Abraham Lincoln*, II, 809.

of Pennsylvania's governor-elect, Andrew G. Curtin, for advice regarding his inaugural address was equally clear:

I think of nothing proper for me to suggest except a word about this secession and disunion movement. On that subject, I think you would do well to express, without passion, threat, or appearance of boasting, but nevertheless, with firmness, the purpose of yourself, and your state to maintain the Union at all hazards. Also, if you can, procure the Legislature to pass resolutions to that effect.³²

More than once during his trip to Washington in February, Lincoln gave additional evidence of his coercionist views. His remarks to an Indianapolis audience on February 11 were aptly defined as his "key-note."³³ By the simple process of putting suggestive questions to his listeners, he implied an intention to "hold and retake . . . [the] forts and other property, and collect the duties on foreign importations."³⁴ From this the Washington correspondent of the *New York Tribune* concluded that Lincoln believed "that he has a right to use force against the seceding States to the extent of recovering United States property, collecting the revenues and enforcing the laws generally."³⁵ To the *New York Herald* the speech was "the signal for massacre and bloodshed by the incoming administration."³⁶ Thereafter, perhaps alarmed by the sensational response, Lincoln spoke with greater caution.³⁷ Yet he told the New Jersey state assembly, on February 21, that "it may be necessary to put the foot down firmly."³⁸

Meanwhile the President-elect had been revising and polishing his inaugural address.³⁹ The original document had contained a blunt

³² Lincoln to Andrew G. Curtin, December 21, 1860, in Paul M. Angle (ed.), *New Letters and Papers of Lincoln* (Boston, 1930), 260.

³³ John G. Nicolay, *The Outbreak of Rebellion* (New York, 1881), 48.

³⁴ Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 111-12; Indianapolis *Daily Journal*, February 12, 1861.

³⁵ *New York Tribune*, February 18, 1861. See also, *New York Evening Post*, February 12, 13, 1861.

³⁶ *New York Herald*, February 13, 14, 1861.

³⁷ Tarbell, *Life of Lincoln*, I, 417.

³⁸ Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 152-54.

³⁹ According to Herndon, Lincoln used only four references in the preparation of his inaugural: a copy of the Constitution, Jackson's proclamation on nullification, Clay's

coercion threat. "All the power at my disposal," it stated, "will be used to reclaim the public property and places which have fallen." While rejecting Seward's proposal to substitute a meaningless vagary, he accepted the advice of Orville H. Browning and omitted this phrase. But this deletion does not necessarily imply a change in Lincoln's original plans. Indeed Browning had defended his suggestion purely on the grounds of expediency. "The fallen places ought to be reclaimed," he wrote. "But cannot that be accomplished as well or even better without announcing the purpose in your inaugural?"⁴⁰ Even after this change, the address still indicated that the new President might feel constrained under certain conditions to resort to the use of force. Besides referring to contingencies which could produce civil war, Lincoln announced his intention to see "that the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the States," to "hold, occupy, and possess the property and places belonging to the government, and to collect the duties and imposts."⁴¹

To one northern Democratic paper the inaugural was "a tiger's claw concealed under the fur of Sewardism."⁴² Secessionists agreed almost unanimously that it threatened coercion.⁴³ The Republican *Boston Daily Advertiser* penetrated its meaning with uncommon acumen. The President, it believed, had implied that he would be discreet and conciliatory, but that he recognized "the natural limits of that discretion."

. . . The address itself [it concluded] contemplates the possibility of an interruption of the peace. We understand the President to disclaim the intention of doing many things which he thinks himself authorized to do, but which he can forbear doing without detriment to the claims of the government. . . . But there is obviously a limit to this forbearance, and a limit to the concessions which the government should make for the preservation of peace. . . . Such powers as are confided to him . . . the President will use, with a due regard to practical

speech in the Senate in February, 1850, and Webster's reply to Hayne, which he admired as the "grandest specimen of American oratory." Angle (ed.), *Herndon's Lincoln*, 386.

⁴⁰ Nicolay and Hay, *Lincoln*, III, 333-34.

⁴¹ Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 169-85.

⁴² Philadelphia *Pennsylvanian*, quoted in New York *Evening Post*, March 5, 1861.

⁴³ New York *Evening Post*, March 8, 9, 1861; New York *Tribune*, March 5, 1861.

policy, but with no thought of foregoing the exercise of a right essential to the existence of the government, because resistance to it is threatened.⁴⁴

The fact that Lincoln intimated the possible use of force does not necessarily imply that he visualized, as an inevitable consequence, a long civil war, or the need for any war at all. Like many others, he may have felt that "a little show of force," entailing a minimum of bloodshed, would suffice to crush the southern rebellion.⁴⁵ The South might submit to the first military or naval demonstration, or soon thereafter. The consequence of coercive measures, however, was really out of the President's hands. It would depend upon the secessionists. And it was from this critical fact that Lincoln formulated his basic stratagem.

From the outset the new President had three clear advantages in dealing with the disunion crisis. First, the northern people, with few exceptions, agreed with him in denying the right of secession. However many may have favored compromise and hoped to avoid war, the masses of Republicans and Democrats alike shared the belief that the Union was perpetual.⁴⁶ It was not difficult, or even necessary, to con-

⁴⁴ Boston *Daily Advertiser*, March 9, 1861.

⁴⁵ The Washington Correspondent of the *New York Tribune*, December 18, 1860, wrote: "The national government may have to *show* its teeth, but it is not at all likely that it will have to *use* them." See also, Philadelphia Correspondence in *ibid.*, January 21, 1861; Boston *Evening Transcript*, November 30, 1860; Laura A. White, "Charles Sumner and the Crisis of 1860-61," in Avery Craven (ed.), *Essays in Honor of William E. Dodd* (Chicago, 1935), 152-55.

⁴⁶ In his last message to Congress in December, 1860, President Buchanan not only denied the right of secession, but asserted that it would be his duty to enforce the laws in the South. James D. Richardson (ed.), *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789-1897*, 10 vols. (Washington, 1896-1899), V, 626-37. See also, Buchanan's letter to the South Carolina Commissioners, December 31, 1860, in *War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, 129 vols. and index (Washington, 1880-1901), Ser. I, Vol. I, pp. 115-18. Senator Stephen A. Douglas repeatedly denied the right of secession. See his letter to the *Memphis Appeal*, quoted in *New York Evening Post*, February 5, 1861; Washington Correspondent of *New York Herald*, December 8, 1860; George Fort Milton, *The Eve of Conflict: Stephen A. Douglas and the Needless War* (Boston, 1934), 520-21. For expressions of this opinion in the Democratic press, see *New York Herald*, November 13, 21, December 12, 27, 30, 1860; *New York Leader*, January 5, 1861; *Boston Post*, November 10, December 6, 1860; *New York Journal of Commerce*, November 8, December 6, 1860; *Albany Atlas and Argus*, quoted in *New York Evening Post*, January 2, 1861. For a similar view in a Bell-Everett paper, see *Boston Daily Courier*, March 23, 25, 1861.

Significantly the Republican papers which allegedly favored permitting the South to

vince them that the preservation of the Union was a vital national interest. A second advantage grew out of the fact that the burden of direct action rested with the seceding states which, after all, were seeking to disturb the political *status quo*. They felt it necessary, in order to make their independence a reality, to seize government forts and other property, and to destroy the symbols of federal authority. As a result, the Union government could easily pretend to forego aggressive action and simulate a defensive pose. In other words, the exigencies of the situation dictated to a practical statesman the strategy of defense, of throwing the initiative to the South.

And here is where Lincoln's third great advantage found its usefulness. Given the general northern belief that the Union was not and could not be dissolved, the government was free to make a number of "defensive" moves. These seemingly non-aggressive acts could include such things as collecting the revenues, holding federal property, perhaps even reinforcing the forts or recovering those that might be seized. Such action, it was widely felt, would be far different from marching a hostile army into the South to overawe and coerce it.⁴⁷ Of course secessionists, who regarded the dissolution of the Union as an accomplished fact, brushed aside these fine distinctions and branded any federal intervention in the South as coercion. But, although abstract logic was

secede in peace almost invariably placed such qualifications on the process as to make it meaningless. See, for example, *New York Tribune*, November 2, 9, 16, 26, December 3, 1860; January 14, 1861; *New York World*, December 8, 15, 1860; *Springfield Republican*, November 10, 15, 22, December 3, 1860; *Indianapolis Daily Journal*, December 24, 1860; January 19, 1861. See also, David M. Potter, "Horace Greeley and Peaceable Secession," in *Journal of Southern History*, VII (1941), 145-59.

⁴⁷ The Boston *Daily Advertiser*, December 24, 1860, said: "There is no form in which coercion . . . can be applied. The general government can do no more than see that its laws are carried out." See also, *New York Evening Post*, December 20, 1860; January 30, February 16, March 6, 1861; *New York Tribune*, November 24, 1860; *Hartford Courant*, quoted in *New York Tribune*, February 15, 1861; *Springfield Republican*, November 24, December 8, 1860; *Indianapolis Daily Journal*, December 6, 21, 1860. This is the precise distinction which Buchanan made when he denied the right of coercion but proclaimed it to be his duty to enforce the laws. Richardson (ed.), *Messages and Papers of the Presidents*, V, 626-37. Lincoln made the same distinction in his Indianapolis address on February 11. Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 112-15. Yet, whatever constitutional distinction exists between coercing a sovereign state and using force to maintain federal authority, the practical result is the same.

doubtless on their side, to Lincoln this was irrelevant. Always holding the Union above peace, he exploited his three strategic advantages in order to cast coercion in the mold of "defense," and to shift the responsibility for consequences to his "dissatisfied fellow-countrymen."

In no sense was this defensive concept an original contribution to the crisis on Lincoln's part. From the outset the Republican press expressed the formula with remarkable spontaneity. "The Republican policy," asserted the Springfield (Massachusetts) *Republican*, "will be to make no war upon the seceding states, to reject all propositions for secession, to hold them to the discharge of their constitutional duties, to collect the revenues as usual in southern ports, and calmly await the result. There can be no war unless the seceders make war upon the general government."⁴⁸ The New York *Evening Post* suggested that if South Carolina should make it impossible to collect duties at Charleston, Congress could simply close it as a port of entry. "Here then we have a peaceful antidote for that 'peaceful remedy' which is called secession. It is no act of war, nor hostility, to revoke the permission given to any town to be opened as a port of entry; but when that permission is revoked it would be an act of hostility . . . to disregard the injunction."⁴⁹ A northern clergyman summed up the strategy neatly in advising the South: "Secede on paper as much as you please. We will not make war upon you for that. But we will maintain the supremacy of the constitution and laws. If you make war on the Union, we will defend it at all cost, and the guilt of blood be on your heads."⁵⁰ Thus the strategy, occasionally defined as one of "masterly inactivity,"⁵¹ had

⁴⁸ Springfield *Republican*, December 19, 1860.

⁴⁹ New York *Evening Post*, December 10, 1860.

⁵⁰ Rev. C. S. Henry to Senator —, *ibid.*, January 30, 1861. For additional expressions of the strategy of defense, see *ibid.*, January 18, February 16, 18, 1861; New York *Tribune*, January 24, 1861; New York *Courier and Enquirer*, December 10, 29, 1860; New York *World*, February 1, 1861; Boston *Journal*, January 16, 1861; Springfield *Republican*, January 2, 12, February 4, 9, 19, 1861; Worcester *Spy*, February 6, 1861; Indianapolis *Daily Journal*, December 27, 1860; January 8, 1861.

⁵¹ New York *Times*, March 21, 1861; Boston *Daily Advertiser*, November 12, 16, 17, 22, December 3, 1860.

been outlined in advance; Lincoln had only to read the newspapers to discover its value.

From the time the President-elect left Springfield in February until the firing upon Fort Sumter, the central theme of his public utterances was the further development and clarification of the strategy of defense. Holding inflexibly to the view that his fundamental purpose must be the preservation of the Union, he chose his words carefully and shrewdly to absolve himself from any charge of aggression. Appreciating the possibility that hostilities might ensue, Lincoln seemed preoccupied with an intense desire to leave the record clear, to make it evident to the northern people that war, if it came, would be started by the South. His words were not those of a man confused about the true situation, about what his policy should be, or about possible consequences. The coercive intimations were nearly always of a sort that could be perceived only by southern secessionists, seldom by northern Unionists.

During his first stop, at Indianapolis, Lincoln began at once to expound his defensive strategy. In a speech from the balcony of the Bates House he denied any intention to invade the South with a hostile army, and implied that the government would only defend itself and its property.⁵² On February 21 he assured the New Jersey legislature that he would do everything possible to secure a peaceful settlement. "The man does not live who is more devoted to peace than I am."⁵³ The next day, before the Pennsylvania legislature, he expressed regret "that a necessity may arise in this country for the use of the military arm. . . . I promise that so far as I may have wisdom to direct, if so painful result shall in any wise be brought about, it shall be through no fault of mine."⁵⁴ A few hours later, shortly before his secret trip to Washington, Lincoln spoke with unusual clarity. "Now in my view of the present aspect of affairs," he said, "there is no need of bloodshed

⁵² Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 112-15; Indianapolis *Daily Journal*, February 12, 1861.

⁵³ Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 152-54.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, VI, 162-65.

and war. There is no necessity for it. I am not in favor of such a course; and I may say in advance that there will be no bloodshed unless it is forced upon the government. The government will not use force, unless force is used against it."⁵⁵

The strategy was rounded out with additional assurances to the South that its rights would be protected, thereby denying the necessity of secession in self-defense.⁵⁶ Hence he could insist innocently that "there is no crisis but an artificial one," that "there is nothing that really hurts anybody."⁵⁷ Always embarrassed by the popular election returns, Lincoln also sought to convey the impression that a major issue was the right of the majority to rule.⁵⁸ Finally, he placed the question of the Union squarely in the hands of the American people. He was but their servant, elected to do their wishes. Without their support he was helpless; with it the Union must triumph. Summing up, he said:

In all trying positions in which I shall be placed, and doubtless I shall be placed in many such, my reliance will be upon . . . the people of the United States; and I wish you to remember, now and forever, that it is your business, and not mine; that if the Union of these States and the liberties of this people shall be lost, it is but little to any one man of fifty-two years of age, but a great deal to the thirty millions of people who inhabit these United States, and to their posterity in all coming time. It is your business to rise up and preserve the Union and liberty for yourselves, and not for me. I appeal to you again to constantly bear in mind that not with politicians, not with Presidents, not with office-seekers, but with you, is the question: shall the Union and shall the liberties of this country be preserved to the latest generations.⁵⁹

Since there were few aspects of the strategy of defense that had not already been discussed, Lincoln's inaugural address presented little more than a final clear exposition of the formula. He again insisted that in maintaining the authority of the government "there needs be no

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, VI, 156-58.

⁵⁶ See especially Lincoln's address to the mayor and citizens of Cincinnati, *ibid.*, VI, 119.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, VI, 121-22, 124-29.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, VI, 122-23.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, VI, 111-12, 142-44, 145, 160-62.

bloodshed or violence; and there shall be none, unless it be forced upon the national authority." He would abstain from doing many things which he had a right to do, but which could be foregone without injury to the prestige of the government. He desired a peaceful solution, but contended that the matter was really beyond his control. "In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow-countrymen," he declared, "and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The government will not assail you. You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in heaven to destroy the government, while I shall have the most solemn one to 'preserve, protect, and defend it.'"⁶⁰

Thus by the time of his inauguration Lincoln had made it clear enough that his policy would be the preservation of the Union through a defensive strategy. With consummate skill he had at once hamstrung the South, satisfied the mass of the northern people that he contemplated no aggression, and yet conveyed his determination to defend the authority of the federal government. The Republican press glowed with appreciation. "No party can be formed against the administration on the issue presented by the inaugural," observed one friendly editor.⁶¹ Another noted that "the fiat of peace or war is in the hands of Mr. Davis rather than of Mr. Lincoln."⁶² Samuel Bowles of the *Springfield Republican* believed that the inaugural had put "the secession conspirators manifestly in the wrong, and hedges them in so that they cannot take a single step without making treasonable war upon the government, which will only defend itself."⁶³ By the fourth of March Lincoln had already cornered the disunionists.

It should be evident, then, that Lincoln's reaction to the problem of supplying Fort Sumter, which faced him as soon as he came into office,

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, VI, 169-85. In the first draft the following words concluded the paragraph quoted above: "You can forbear the assault upon it, I cannot shrink from the defense of it. With you, and not with me, is the solemn question of 'Shall it be peace or a sword.'"
Nicolay and Hay, *Lincoln*, III, 343.

⁶¹ *Springfield Republican*, March 6, 1861.

⁶² *Boston Journal*, March 12, 1861.

⁶³ *Springfield Republican*, March 6, 1861.

was in perfect harmony with his strategy of defense. His decision to sustain the Sumter garrison involved no change of plans or sudden determination to provoke the war.⁶⁴ It was a logical consequence of the President's fixed determination to defend the Union even at the risk of hostilities. Had the Sumter crisis not arisen, or had Lincoln been convinced ultimately that military necessity dictated evacuation,⁶⁵ his strategy inevitably would have led to some comparable result. In fact, while the new administration prepared to supply Major Robert Anderson, it also sought other means of developing its defensive formula. On March 9, for example, Lincoln instructed General Scott "to exercise all possible vigilance for the maintenance of all the places within the military department of the United States, and to promptly call upon all the departments of the government for the means necessary to that end."⁶⁶ A few days later when he learned that Texas secessionists had deposed Governor Sam Houston, Lincoln offered him military and naval support if he would put himself at the head of a Union party.⁶⁷ Simultaneously the President considered the collection

⁶⁴ Lincoln finally decided on March 29 to prepare the Sumter expedition. Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 226-27. For alleged evidence that the Sumter garrison was not short of supplies, and that Anderson never reported such a shortage, see Tilley, *Lincoln Takes Command*, *passim*. For evidence that Anderson did report the approaching exhaustion of his supplies in a letter (since lost) dated February 27, see Potter, *Lincoln and His Party in the Secession Crisis*, 333-35. For additional evidence that the garrison had nearly exhausted its supply of pork, flour, beans, coffee, sugar, and salt, see Anderson to Colonel L. Thomas, April 1, 1861, in *Official Records*, Ser. I, Vol. I, pp. 230-31. In another letter to Thomas, dated April 4, Anderson actually referred to his letter of February 27 reporting the exhaustion of his supplies. *Ibid.*, Ser. I, Vol. I, pp. 236-37.

⁶⁵ For the testimony of army men that military necessity required the evacuation of Sumter, see Secretary of War Simon Cameron to Lincoln, March 16, 1861, in Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 202-207. There is evidence that Lincoln proposed the abandonment of Fort Sumter to a delegation of Virginia Unionists if they "would break up their convention, without any row or nonsense." But the offer was rejected. See Potter, *Lincoln and His Party in the Secession Crisis*, 353-58. Whether Lincoln seriously expected the Virginians to accept the offer cannot be ascertained. In any event, the President still would have been free to develop his strategy of defense in other directions.

⁶⁶ Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 188.

⁶⁷ For Houston's rejection of this offer, see Houston to Charles A. Waite, March 29, 1861, in Amelia W. Williams and Eugene C. Barker (eds.), *The Writings of Sam*

of duties from naval vessels off southern ports, or even a blockade of the Confederacy.⁶⁸

But Lincoln's most important action, aside from the move to supply Sumter, had reference to Fort Pickens. In January, President Buchanan had sent reinforcements on the U.S.S. *Brooklyn* to Pensacola Harbor, but they were not landed when he agreed to a truce with certain secessionist leaders. On March 11, Lincoln ordered Scott to instruct the commander to land these troops at once.⁶⁹ On April 6, however, a special messenger arrived from Pickens with the news that the reinforcements had not disembarked, for Captain H. A. Adams of the *Brooklyn* denied that Scott's orders could supersede those of the former Secretary of the Navy. The President dispatched new instructions immediately, and the troops landed on April 12 while Anderson was still in possession of Sumter.⁷⁰

Yet, in his message to the special session of Congress which assembled on July 4, Lincoln suggested that he might have ordered the evacuation of Sumter if Pickens could have been reinforced before Anderson exhausted his supplies. He could have avoided injuring the national cause, he said, by thus demonstrating that he was yielding only to military necessity. Apparently still seeking to impress the nation with his peaceful intentions, Lincoln declared that the April 6 report on the failure to reinforce Fort Pickens had prompted him to send the relief expedition to Anderson. This decision was motivated, he added, by the desire to prevent "our national destruction" and to give "bread to the few brave and hungry men of the garrison."⁷¹

Houston, 8 vols. (Austin, 1938-1943), VIII, 294. See also, Nicolay, *Outbreak of Rebellion*, 14, and Tarbell, *Life of Lincoln*, II, 20-22.

⁶⁸ Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 224-25.

⁶⁹ Montgomery C. Meigs, Diary, entry of March 31, 1861 (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress); Nicolay and Hay, *Lincoln*, III, 393-94; *Official Records*, Ser. I, Vol. I, p. 360.

⁷⁰ *The Diary of Gideon Welles*, 3 vols. (Boston, 1911), I, 29-32; Nicolay and Hay, *Lincoln*, IV, 7-9, 11-13; Nicolay, *Outbreak of Rebellion*, 53.

⁷¹ Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 297-325. In a sense, Lincoln thereby confessed that he held the prevention of "our national destruction" above peace.

In stating that the voluntary surrender of Sumter hinged upon the successful reinforcement of Pickens, Lincoln gave evidence of confusion, for it is difficult to harmonize this interpretation with the known facts. No member of the cabinet, at any time, revealed the knowledge that this was Lincoln's plan. Indeed, on April 1, the President informed Seward categorically that he did "not propose to abandon Fort Sumter."⁷² Moreover, the debate on supplying Sumter went on in the cabinet and in Lincoln's mind *after* the order to reinforce Pickens had been sent, an order which the President had no reason to believe would not be executed at once. Most important was the fact that Captain Gustavus Vasa Fox, who commanded the relief expedition to Sumter, received his final instructions to go forward on April 4, the same day that a letter was written to Anderson notifying him that supplies were being sent.⁷³ Since the expedition did not start for several days, there was still time to countermand Fox's orders. But the letter to Sumter must have been dispatched before the arrival of the messenger from Pickens on April 6, for Anderson received it the following day.⁷⁴ A letter could not have reached Anderson in less than twenty-four hours. And finally, since reinforcements actually entered Pickens on April 12, Lincoln *did* achieve that objective before Anderson's capitulation. That a second body of troops under Captain Montgomery C. Meigs did not reach Fort Pickens until April 17 was, therefore, irrelevant.⁷⁵ Lincoln had approached Sumter and Pickens as separate problems, although his action in each case was part of a unified program.

⁷² *Ibid.*, VI, 236-37.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, VI, 239-40; Nicolay and Hay, *Lincoln*, IV, 27-29. See also, Ramsdell, "Lincoln and Fort Sumter," *loc. cit.*, 279, and Randall, "When War Came in 1861," *loc. cit.*, 18-23.

⁷⁴ Anderson reported receiving the message "by yesterday's mail" in a letter to Colonel Thomas, dated April 8. *Official Records*, Ser. I, Vol. I, p. 294. Lincoln's private secretaries insisted that the letter to Anderson of April 4 "was immediately sent by mail to Sumter." Nicolay and Hay, *Lincoln*, IV, 27-29.

⁷⁵ Nicolay and Hay, *Lincoln*, IV, 3-7, 16-17. Quite relevant, however, was the fact that the Meigs expedition to Fort Pickens was instructed to stop en route at Key West. Meigs brought commissions for new federal officers to replace the secessionists, and authority for the commanding officer at Fort Taylor to proclaim martial law. *Ibid.*, IV, 14-15.

Thus it was not the Sumter plan alone, but all these activities combined, which illustrated the rapid development of Lincoln's strategy of defense. Step by step he was quietly moving to assert and vindicate federal authority in the South. Before each advance the secessionists would have had to retreat, until they found themselves discredited before their own people and, for all practical purposes, back in the Union. Their only alternative was resistance, but always the burden of aggression would be upon them. Lincoln's record would remain clear in the eyes of the northern people.

If Lincoln ever seriously believed that his problem could be solved by voluntary reconstruction—and there is nothing to indicate that he had completely ruled out this solution in the early stages of the crisis—his mind must have been disabused of this notion long before the guns of Sumter began to speak. The transparent hostility of the leading secessionists to plans for adjustment,⁷⁶ the rapid organization of a Confederate government, and the military preparations in the South would have hardly encouraged confidence in this formula. Besides, the Republican press had confidently predicted that Lincoln would pursue a "vigorous policy." Amid the abuse directed at Buchanan for his "weakness" and "submission to treason" came assertions that the new President would soon demonstrate that "we still have a government." The following comment in the *New York Courier and Enquirer* was typical:

Mr. Buchanan may strive to get rid of his obligations to the Constitution and the Union, imposed by his oath of office and "the Supreme law of the land;" but Mr. Lincoln . . . is not the man to shrink from the performance of any duty. Like Jackson he may regret the necessity of shedding blood in the faithful discharge of his duties; but having accepted the Presidency, and solemnly sworn to sustain the Constitution, preserve the Union, and execute the laws, he will not be wanting in the hour of trial.⁷⁷

⁷⁶ Alda Gregory, "The Southern Congressional Delegation and Compromise, 1860-1861" (M.A. thesis, University of Maryland, 1944).

⁷⁷ *New York Courier and Enquirer*, December 14, 1860. For similar expressions see *ibid.*, January 8, 9, 15, 16, 23, 1861; *New York Evening Post*, November 6, 13, 1860; January 21, 1861; *New York World*, February 14, 25, 1861; *New York Tribune*, December 15, 16, 20, 1860; January 19, February 8, 19, 1861; *Bangor Whig and Courier*,

These earlier prognostications, combined with the secrecy which covered the development of Lincoln's strategy, threatened to discredit his administration unless there was immediate and vigorous action. The widespread rumors in March that Sumter was to be evacuated gave the anti-Republican press an opportunity to jibe at the new President. "This administration," mocked the Democratic Cleveland *Plain Dealer*, "after all its blustering about 'enforcing the laws in all the states,' not only surrenders Sumter but South Carolina and the whole South."⁷⁸ The opposition insisted that Lincoln was merely continuing Buchanan's "weak" policy.⁷⁹

Even before Lincoln's inauguration there were abundant signs that the general uncertainty was becoming intolerable.⁸⁰ More and more it appeared that time was not on the side of the Union, that the secession movement was actually gaining in strength. After March 4, Republican leaders bombarded Lincoln with advice favoring a decisive move, and with warnings that the people would not tolerate the abandonment of Sumter.⁸¹ Simultaneously the differences between northern

quoted in New York *Tribune*, February 19, 1861; Bridgeport *Standard*, quoted in *ibid.*, February 25, 1861; Chicago *Journal*, quoted in *ibid.*, February 26, 1861; Springfield *Republican*, November 15, 1860; January 9, 1861; Indianapolis *Daily Journal*, February 12, 1861.

⁷⁸ Cleveland *Plain Dealer*, quoted in New York *World*, March 22, 1861. See also, New York *Herald*, March 12, 1861; Boston *Post*, March 16, 21, 1861.

⁷⁹ New York *Herald*, March 16, 25, 1861; New York *Morning Express*, April 1, 1861; Boston *Daily Courier*, March 11, 16, 1861; Buffalo *Courier*, quoted in Springfield *Republican*, March 29, 1861. On April 8, the Republican New York *Evening Post* confessed: "Since Mr. Lincoln came into power there has been with some a disposition to censure his seeming inactivity, and to complain that his Administration, thus far, has been only a continuation of the disgraceful policy of his predecessor."

⁸⁰ See, for example, New York *Herald*, January 21, 1861; New York *World*, February 23, 27, 1861; letter from "One," in New York *Evening Post*, February 25, 1861; Washington Correspondence in Springfield *Republican*, February 22, 1861.

⁸¹ New York *Evening Post*, March 11, 13, 23, 1861; Washington Correspondence in New York *Herald*, March 14, 28, 1861; New York *Courier and Enquirer*, March 26, April 4, 1861; New York *World*, March 9, April 4, 1861; New York *Times*, April 3, 1861; New York *Tribune*, March 12, 14, 16, 18, 25, April 2, 3, 1861; Boston *Evening Transcript*, March 20, April 6, 1861; Boston *Daily Advertiser*, March 13, 1861; Boston Correspondence in Springfield *Republican*, March 16, 1861; William D. Foulke, *Life of Oliver P. Morton*, 2 vols. (Indianapolis, 1899), I, 113-14; Samuel W. Crawford, *The Genesis of the Civil War: The Story of Sumter* (New York, 1887), 364.

and southern tariff schedules frightened many conservative merchants into a mood for drastic remedies.⁸² By the end of March numerous businessmen had reached the point where they felt that anything—even war—was better than the existing indecision which was so fatal to trade. "It is a singular fact," wrote one observer, "that merchants who, two months ago, were fiercely shouting 'no coercion,' now ask for anything rather than *inaction*."⁸³ Even anti-Republican and anti-coercion papers could bear the suspense no longer and urged that something be done.⁸⁴ Lincoln might well have desired a little more time to organize his administration before dealing with the secessionists. But the general unrest in the North, as well as the Sumter crisis, forced his hand at once. The time for delay had passed.

It was in this atmosphere that Lincoln dispatched the relief expedition to Fort Sumter.⁸⁵ Every circumstance combined to make this a satisfactory culmination of his defensive strategy. Popular attention long had been focused upon this point. A southern attack was almost certain to consolidate northern opinion behind the new administration, and submission would seriously damage Confederate prestige. Having authorized Seward to promise the southern commissioners that relief would not be sent without due notice,⁸⁶ the President could be doubly

⁸² New York *Evening Post*, March 7, 12, 21, 22, 26, 1861; New York *Herald*, March 16, 23, 1861; New York *Courier and Enquirer*, March 14, 15 (Commercial Column), 1861; Boston *Daily Advertiser*, March 14, 1861; Boston *Daily Evening Traveller*, April 6, 1861. For a brilliant analysis of the influence of the tariff issue on the New York merchants, see Philip S. Foner, *Business and Slavery: The New York Merchants and the Irrepressible Conflict* (Chapel Hill, 1941), 275 ff.

⁸³ Washington Correspondence in New York *Evening Post*, March 29, 1861. See also, Commercial Columns of New York *Herald*, March 20, 26, April 5, 1861; of New York *Courier and Enquirer*, March 16, 18, 19, 25, 1861; and of New York *Tribune*, March 23, 1861.

⁸⁴ New York *Herald*, March 9, 1861; New York *Morning Express*, April 5, 1861; New York *Leader*, March 30, 1861; Boston *Post*, March 23, April 6, 1861. A Washington dispatch to the New York *Tribune*, April 8, 1861, reported that there was as much pressure for decisive action from Democrats as from Republicans.

⁸⁵ Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 239-40; Nicolay and Hay, *Lincoln*, IV, 27-29. For details of the preparations and last minute negotiations, see Tarbell, *Life of Lincoln*, II, 17-19; Ramsdell, "Lincoln and Fort Sumter," *loc. cit.*, 273-82; and Potter, *Lincoln and His Party in the Secession Crisis*, 336 ff.

⁸⁶ Nicolay and Hay, *Lincoln*, IV, 33-35; Nicolay, *Outbreak of Rebellion*, 55.

sure that this step would be decisive. Above all, the fact that he could force the issue by merely sending supplies served to underscore the defensive nature of his move.⁸⁷ Whether the Confederates attacked or submitted, Lincoln would triumph.

The President himself pointed to the Sumter expedition as the fulfillment of the strategy he had outlined in the past. He did it first in his reply to Seward's memorandum of April 1, in which the Secretary of State proposed, for all practical purposes, a strategy of defense, except that he favored the evacuation of Sumter.⁸⁸ Professing surprise at this, Lincoln reminded Seward that his inaugural embraced "the exact domestic policy you now urge, with the single exception that it does not propose to abandon Fort Sumter."⁸⁹ Even more emphatic was his response, on April 13, to the delegation sent by the Virginia Convention to inquire about his policy. "Not having as yet seen the occasion to change," he said, "it is now my purpose to pursue the course marked out in the inaugural address." He would still hold federal property in the South. If it proved true, however, that "an unprovoked assault has been made upon Fort Sumter," he would then feel free to "repossess" the places seized before his inauguration. It was at this point, if he had not done so before, that Lincoln expressed a clear and unqualified decision in favor of coercion. Yet he still took pains to give it a defensive cloak, for he added that he would simply "repel force by force."⁹⁰

The Confederate attack upon Fort Sumter was, in effect, a striking victory for Lincoln's strategy of defense. And just as Republican editors had first presented the formula, their appreciation of its success was immediate and spontaneous. In one great chorus they united in

⁸⁷ See Lincoln's instructions to R. S. Chew, his messenger to Governor Francis W. Pickens of South Carolina, in Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 241.

⁸⁸ Seward advocated the defense and reinforcement of all the Gulf ports, and the establishment of a blockade. "This will raise distinctly the question of union or disunion," he wrote. "I would maintain every fort or possession in the South." Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 234-36.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, VI, 236-37.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, VI, 243-45.

denouncing the secessionists as the aggressors. "It was," wrote one, "an audacious and insulting aggression upon the authority of the Republic, without provocation or excuse."⁹¹ A Boston paper piously regarded the event as one which furnished "precisely the stimulus which . . . a good Providence sends to arouse the latent patriotism of the people."⁹² "*Let it be remembered*," cried the *Providence Journal*, "*that the Southern government has put itself wholly in the wrong, and is the aggressor. On its head must be the responsibility for the consequences.*"⁹³ These, of course, were mere reflections of the opinions of an indignant northern people.

Only a few cynical editors survived in those exciting days. Early in April the *Albany Argus* hinted "that the administration of Mr. Lincoln is disposed to secretly provoke a fight; and that it looks to some collision at the South, commenced on that side, to arouse Northern feeling."⁹⁴ Another critic believed that the Sumter expedition was designed "*to provoke and draw the first fire, from the Montgomery government.*"⁹⁵ "By this cunningly contrived plan," added a Democratic editor, "it is hoped the responsibility of commencing hostilities will be thrown upon the South."⁹⁶ The reason: "Nothing but a war can keep together the Republican party."⁹⁷ Within a few days, however, the doubters were either converted or silent.

That Lincoln calculated the danger of Confederate resistance at Charleston is beyond a reasonable doubt. The messengers sent to Sumter in March gave him abundant opportunities to know the state

⁹¹ *New Haven Journal and Courier*, quoted in *New York Tribune*, April 15, 1861.

⁹² *Boston Daily Advertiser*, April 15, 1861.

⁹³ *Providence Journal*, quoted in *Boston Evening Transcript*, April 13, 1861. See also *New York Tribune*, April 5, 9, 11, 1861; *New York World*, April 6, 8, 13, 16, 1861; *New York Courier and Enquirer*, April 10, 1861; *New York Commercial Advertiser*, April 9, 1861; *Springfield Republican*, April 13, 1861; *Boston Journal*, April 11, 1861; *Indianapolis Daily Journal*, April 11, 13, 1861.

⁹⁴ *Albany Argus*, quoted in *Boston Post*, April 6, 1861.

⁹⁵ *New York Morning Express*, April 11, 1861.

⁹⁶ *Utica Observer*, quoted in *New York Tribune*, April 13, 1861. See also, *New York Herald*, March 9, 11, 19, April 5, 9, 1861.

⁹⁷ Washington Correspondence of *New York Journal of Commerce*, quoted in *New York Morning Express*, April 15, 1861.

of feeling in South Carolina. During the period of preparation the President strove to organize the defenses of Washington.⁹⁸ On April 9 he warned Governor Curtin of "the necessity of being ready," and urged him to prepare for an emergency.⁹⁹ John G. Nicolay and John Hay, Lincoln's private secretaries, believed that it was "reasonably certain" that he expected hostilities to ensue.¹⁰⁰ And when the news arrived of the attack upon Sumter, they noted that Lincoln was neither surprised nor excited.¹⁰¹ Most conclusive was the fact that if the President believed that Sumter could be supplied peacefully, there was no reason why he should ever have considered evacuation as a possible military necessity.

There is no evidence that Lincoln regarded the result of his strategy with anything but satisfaction. Having founded his policy upon the desire to preserve the Union at all costs, he had reason to congratulate himself, for with a united North behind him that achievement was inevitable. "You and I both anticipated," he wrote to Captain Fox, "that the cause of the country would be advanced by making the attempt to provision Fort Sumter, even if it should fail; and it is no small consolation now to feel that our anticipation is justified by the result."¹⁰² A few months later, when he had gained greater perspective, Lincoln again expressed this opinion to Senator Browning, but added the belief that the fall of the fort, in the long run, was more useful than a successful effort to supply.¹⁰³

Nicolay and Hay also believed that Lincoln regarded the success or failure of the Sumter expedition as "a question of minor importance." More significant was his determination that "the rebellion should be put in the wrong," that the Confederates "would not be able to con-

⁹⁸ Nicolay and Hay, *Lincoln*, IV, 64-68.

⁹⁹ Angle (ed.), *New Letters and Papers of Lincoln*, 266. See also, Lincoln to Cameron, April 10, 1861, in Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 242.

¹⁰⁰ Nicolay and Hay, *Lincoln*, IV, 44-45.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, IV, 70.

¹⁰² Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 261-62.

¹⁰³ Theodore C. Pease and James G. Randall (eds.), *The Diary of Orville H. Browning*, 2 vols. (Springfield, 1927), I, 475-76.

vince the world that he had begun civil war.”¹⁰⁴ Indeed Nicolay was certain that it was Lincoln’s “carefully matured purpose to force rebellion to put itself flagrantly and fatally in the wrong by attacking Fort Sumter.”¹⁰⁵ The transparent admiration of Lincoln by his secretaries did not prevent their reaching an accurate conclusion:

When he finally gave the order that the fleet should sail he was master of the situation; master of his Cabinet; master of the moral attitude and issues of the struggle; master of the public opinion which must arise out of the impending conflict; master if the rebels hesitate or repent, because they would thereby forfeit their prestige with the South; master if they persisted, for he would then command a united North.¹⁰⁶

With the fall of Sumter the strategy of defense lost its usefulness, and instantly Lincoln changed his ground. In his proclamation of April 15 calling for 75,000 volunteers there was no reference to the defensive strategy of “holding” or “possessing” federal property. Instead he summoned the militia to suppress an insurrection, “to cause the laws to be duly executed,” to preserve the Union, and “to redress wrongs already long enough endured.”¹⁰⁷ Thus, again, as in his reply to the Virginia delegation, the President endorsed the use of coercive force. A few days later, while addressing the Frontier Guards in Washington, Lincoln gave additional evidence that he had always preferred coercion to disunion. While professing peaceful intentions, he added the opinion that “if the alternative is presented, whether the Union is to be broken in fragments, . . . or blood be shed, you will probably make the choice, with which I shall not be dissatisfied.”¹⁰⁸ Having calculated this contingency almost from the start, Lincoln was now ready to maintain a basic national interest by force, the last resort of all practical statesmen.

Although Lincoln accepted the possibility of war, which, in retrospect at least, was the inevitable consequence of his strategy of defense,

¹⁰⁴ Nicolay and Hay, *Lincoln*, IV, 33, 44-45.

¹⁰⁵ Nicolay, *Outbreak of Rebellion*, 55, 74.

¹⁰⁶ Nicolay and Hay, *Lincoln*, IV, 62.

¹⁰⁷ Nicolay and Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, VI, 246-48.

¹⁰⁸ Hertz, *Abraham Lincoln*, II, 830.

the indictment—if such it be—can be softened by surrounding circumstances. Clearly the burden rested not on Lincoln alone, but on the universal standards of statesmanship and on the whole concept of “national interest.” This was a thing worth fighting for! If Lincoln was no pacifist, neither were his contemporaries. The growing impatience in the North and the widespread demand for action must have contributed something toward shaping his final decision. And it is still a moot question whether it is the function of politicians in a democracy to yield to popular pressures or to resist them. Moreover, without quibbling over who was guilty of the first act of aggression, the fact remains that southern leaders shared with Lincoln the responsibility for a resort to force. They too preferred war to submission.

Nor was it certain that acquiescence in disunion was necessarily a peace formula. Many Northerners believed sincerely that the clash of interests in a divided Union would lead, sooner or later, to armed conflict. Lincoln contended “that far less evil & bloodshed would result from an effort to maintain the Union and the Constitution, than from disruption and the formation of two confederacies.”¹⁰⁹ That this was more than a Republican rationalization was attested by the fact that some conservative Democrats held the same opinion. Thus the pro-Breckinridge *Boston Post* declared: “We have no faith, if the States separate, that there can be a peaceable issue of the vast interests, and the public property, at stake.”¹¹⁰ Certainly Lincoln had no way of knowing positively that his decision to risk hostilities through the Sumter expedition would pave the way to four years of bloody war. He doubtless shared the common belief that the contest would be short.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁹ Pease and Randall (eds.), *Browning Diary*, I, 453.

¹¹⁰ *Boston Post*, December 5, 1860. See also, *New York Herald*, November 19, 30 (Commercial Column), December 3 (Commercial Column), 1860; *Washington Correspondence of New York Tribune*, January 15, 1861; *Washington Correspondence of New York Journal of Commerce*, November 3, December 10, 1860; *New York Courier and Enquirer*, January 8, 1861; *New York Leader*, December 29, 1861; *Buffalo Express*, quoted in *New York World*, March 28, 1861; *Boston Correspondence in Springfield Republican*, March 22, 1861; *Boston Daily Courier*, November 13, 1860.

¹¹¹ Thus the *Springfield Republican*, April 17, 1861, said: “There will be no prolonged

Finally, it may well have been true that the outbreak of war saved the Republican party from disintegration, and that a practical politician like Lincoln could not have overlooked that possibility.¹¹² But its Machiavellian implication is based on sheer speculation. The evidence makes equally valid the conclusion that Lincoln considered only "the cause of the country." Or, again, he may have had a comprehensive understanding of what both the country and political expediency demanded. Perhaps it was simply Lincoln's good fortune that personal, party, and national interests could be served with such favorable coincidence as they were by his strategy of defense.

and doubtful struggle. The country is coming down like an avalanche upon the conspiracy, and it will be annihilated at one fell swoop."

¹¹² Ramsdell, "Lincoln and Fort Sumter," *loc. cit.*, 271-72.

The Civil War Career of Charles Wilkes

BY WILLIAM W. JEFFRIES

Down to the beginning of the Civil War, the activities of Charles Wilkes as an officer in the United States Navy had been noteworthy primarily because of his work as an explorer and his superior ability as a naval scientist. After forty-three years of service, he held the rank of captain and a reputation for being an insubordinate, impulsive, over-zealous, and yet fairly efficient officer. With the coming of the war he returned to active service afloat for the first time since 1842,¹ and during the next three years he became involved in a succession of episodes which kept him almost continuously in difficulty with his associates and his superiors, and which culminated in court-martial proceedings against him in 1864. That he was brought suddenly and unfavorably into international prominence by the *Trent* affair of November, 1861, is well known; but his subsequent participation in the war has been neglected by historians, despite the fact that in many respects this was the most colorful and controversial phase of his entire career.

For a man of Wilkes' temperament, the sudden change from routine peacetime naval duties to the excitement and uncertainty of wartime activities was almost sure to intensify those qualities which had given him a reputation for intractability. The keynote of his long career can perhaps best be summed up as loyalty to his country, an intense ambition, and a strong sense of duty; but in his interpretation of what con-

¹ As a lieutenant, Wilkes had commanded the United States Pacific and Antarctic Exploring Expedition of 1838-1842; and from 1842 to 1861 he had been on shore duty, preparing the reports of that expedition for publication. See Charles Wilkes, *Narrative of the United States Exploring Expedition during the Years 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1842*, 5 vols. (Philadelphia, 1845). At least eight volumes of the scientific portion of the report were also written by him.

stituted his duty and his rights he often differed from the opinion of others. To a great extent he was entirely indifferent to, and inconsiderate of, the feelings and rights—personal and legal—of those with whom he was associated. He was a stern disciplinarian of the "old school" in his relations with his subordinates. Yet, in his relations with his superiors, he was quite likely to disregard naval regulations and etiquette whenever they did not conform to his purpose or his own peculiar ideas of proper behavior. At the same time, perhaps quite logically, he had an abnormal persecution complex. It seems that whenever he was not permitted his own manner of action, whenever he was restrained from carrying out certain of his ideas or aims, or whenever he was brought to task for his various insubordinate or unethical acts, his immediate response was a feeling of righteous indignation against what he termed discrimination. These qualities were in part inherent in his family background, and their development in him was quickened by his pre-war experiences.

Captain Wilkes' first command in the Civil War came when he was ordered to the African coast in May, 1861, to bring the U.S.S. *San Jacinto* back to the United States. It was while he was returning with this vessel to Philadelphia, via the West Indies for the purpose of searching for the Confederate cruiser *Sumter*, that he seized the Confederate commissioners James M. Mason and John Slidell from the British mail-packet *Trent*. When the United States government, in the face of public opinion and with some hesitation, disavowed this act and released the Confederates, England thought that Wilkes was properly chastised and that he would remain in ignominy for the rest of his naval life.² Less than a year later, however, he was given a command in the West Indies, where for a period of nine months he caused British shipping interests, colonial authorities, and diplomatic officials much concern.

In the meantime, he was employed for eight months in more or less routine naval duty in Washington, because, as Secretary of the Navy

² See, especially, London *Times*, January 21, 1862.

Gideon Welles told him, there was no available command suitable to his rank.³ Finally, in July, 1862, probably at the suggestion of President Lincoln and Secretary of State Seward, he was given the command, with the rank of commodore, of the newly organized James River Flotilla, which was to operate on the James River as the means of communication and flank protection of General George B. McClellan's Army of the Potomac.⁴ By this time McClellan had abandoned the first phase of his Peninsular campaign, following the Seven Days' battles, and had withdrawn to Harrison's Landing, a point on the James some twenty miles from Richmond.

Commodore Wilkes immediately began the effective organization of his twenty-three vessels, which acted as a temporarily independent part of the North Atlantic Blockading Squadron. He reported that he also had to bring order out of the chaos created by the several hundred army transports and hospital and supply ships, as well as many other types of vessels on the James. During this billet of less than two months, Wilkes was engaged in routine service of patrolling the river, guarding the strategic points from occupation by Confederate forces, and convoying mail, transport, supply, and hospital ships up and down the river, as well as acting in conjunction with the army in various assignments.⁵

³ Wilkes Diary, December, 1861-June, 1862, *passim*. This Diary, together with a ten-volume manuscript Autobiography and a large assortment of miscellaneous family papers, has been deposited by Mrs. M. L. Hull, of Washington, D. C., in the Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress. This group of papers is referred to hereinafter as Wilkes Papers (Hull Collection), to distinguish it from another collection of Wilkes Papers, also in the Division of Manuscripts, consisting of 16 letter books and 13 letter boxes of Wilkes' personal and official correspondence or memoranda.

⁴ Gideon Welles to Wilkes, July 6, 1862, in *Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in the War of the Rebellion*, 30 vols. (Washington, 1894-1922), Ser. I, Vol. VII, p. 548 (Cited hereinafter as *Official Records, Navies*). See also *Diary of Gideon Welles*, 3 vols. (Boston, 1911), I, 73.

⁵ Wilkes to Welles, July 10, 1862, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. VII, pp. 562-63; Wilkes to Welles, July 15, 1862, *ibid.*, 574-75; Wilkes to Gustavus V. Fox, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, July 28, 1862, *ibid.*, 598; Wilkes Diary, July-August, 1862, *passim*; Wilkes Autobiography (Hull Collection), X, 2631-37; Wilkes to Welles, July 20, 1862, in Gideon Welles Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress), Vol. 50; Wilkes to Welles, July 31, 1862, private, *ibid.*, Vol. 51.

One of his most important tasks while on the *James* was to watch for and to make preparations to repel the C.S.S. *Richmond*, the successor of the old *Merrimack*, as well as other similar rams or warships. Though this vessel never actually threatened Wilkes, he was almost constantly expecting her. Several specific plans of her advance were reported to him, and small incidents at times threw a general scare into the flotilla.⁶

As commander of the James River Flotilla, Wilkes had a controversy with the Navy Department which, as the war progressed, was to become more and more characteristic of the relations between himself and Gideon Welles. Because he felt that the effectiveness of his force would be weakened, Wilkes refused to relay and put into effect orders from the Department for two of his subordinates to report to Washington because of their alleged neglect of duty.⁷ In regard to this and a similar incident Welles noted in his *Diary*:

Have had to write Wilkes pretty decisively. He is very exacting towards others, but is not himself as obedient as he should be. Interposes his own authority to interrupt the execution of the orders of the Department. Wrote him that this was not permissible, that I expected his command to obey him, and that it was no less imperative that he should obey the orders of the Department. I have not heard from him in reply, or explanation. It is pretty evident that he will be likely to cause trouble to the Department. He has abilities but not good judgment in all respects. Will be likely to rashly assume authority, and do things that might involve himself and the country in difficulty, and hence I was glad that not I but the President and the Secretary of State suggested him for that command.⁸

⁶ G. Thorne to Welles, July 3, 1862, in Miscellaneous Letters, Navy Department, July, 1862 (Naval Records Collection of the Office of Naval Records and Library, The National Archives), I, No. 61; Wilkes to Welles, July 26, 1862, in Welles Papers, Vol. 51; Wilkes to Fox, July 22, 1862, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. VII, p. 591; Wilkes to Fox, July 28, 1862, *ibid.*, 598-99; T. S. Seybolt to William H. Seward, July 29, August 3, 1862, both enclosed in Welles to Wilkes, August 4, 1862, *ibid.*, 624.

⁷ Welles to Wilkes, August 5, 1862, in Letters to Flag Officers and Commandants of Vessels, Navy Department (Naval Records Collection of the Office of Naval Records and Library, The National Archives), Vol. 1, pp. 632-33; Wilkes to Welles, August 19, 1862, in Welles Papers, Vol. 51.

⁸ *Diary of Gideon Welles*, I, 73. For Welles' letter censuring Wilkes in this incident, see Welles to Wilkes, August 20, 1862, in Letters to Flag Officers and Commandants of Vessels, Vol. 1, p. 662.

No active offensive movements of any consequence were made by either the Union army or navy during this latter phase of the Peninsular campaign. Wilkes' routine duty, in addition to his incompleting task of organizing his force, prevented any such naval action. But by the time that General-in-Chief Henry W. Halleck deemed it necessary to withdraw the Union army from the York Peninsula in order to co-operate with General John Pope in defending Washington against General Robert E. Lee's northward advance, Wilkes was ready and anxious for a combined land and water attack against Richmond.⁹ Halleck refused to change his plans, and the army was recalled, leaving Wilkes with no military support for his desired attempt on Richmond. Nevertheless, he pressed Welles for permission to try to take Richmond, even without aid from the army.¹⁰ Welles realized, however, that this would be attempting the impossible, and he forbade the attack, recalled the naval force from the James, and placed Wilkes in command of the newly organized Potomac River Flotilla.¹¹

Commodore Wilkes remained in his new command only nine days. During that time he began the organization of his force and stationed his vessels at strategic points to protect the army, watch for the advancing Confederates, and calm the fears of the civilians. But action on the Potomac was too quiet, and from Wilkes' point of view the Navy Department with its inquiring, repressive, and interfering hand was too close for his comfort. Consequently, he welcomed the command of the West India Squadron on September 8, 1862, and a few days later a promotion to acting rear admiral.¹²

An earlier West India Squadron had been disbanded in September,

⁹ Telegram, Wilkes to Welles, August 5, 1862, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. VII, pp. 629-31.

¹⁰ *Diary of Gideon Welles*, I, 81, 83; Wilkes to Welles, August 10, 13, 21, 1862, in Welles Papers, Vol. 51.

¹¹ Welles to Wilkes, August 18, 1862, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. VII pp. 655-56; Welles to Wilkes, August 25, 1862, *ibid.*, Ser. I, Vol. V, pp. 68-69; Welles to Wilkes, August 29, 1862, *ibid.*, 72.

¹² Wilkes Diary, September 1-8, 1862; Wilkes Autobiography, X, 2683; Welles to Wilkes, September 8, 1862, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. I, pp. 470-71; Welles to Wilkes, September 15, 1862, in Appointments, Orders, and Resignations, Navy Department (Naval Records Collection of the Office of Naval Records and Library, The National Archives), Vol. 33, p. 345.

1861, because at that time it was deemed unnecessary to have a separate squadron operating in the West Indies. Soon, however, the rumored arrival of the Confederate commerce-raiders, the *Alabama* and the *Florida*, in those waters and the continued successful blockade-running originating in this locality made it necessary to send a protective force there.¹³

The English, who still thought of Wilkes in unfavorable terms, were displeased with his appointment to a command where he was certain to have a great deal of contact with British officials and interests. The London *Daily News* criticized Lincoln for the "bad taste" shown in sending Wilkes where he would have the chance of causing more trouble instead of putting an officer of "proved discretion" there. The London *Times* was even more outspoken in voicing its disapproval of his new appointment and in showing that it had not forgotten the Wilkes of *Trent* fame.¹⁴

Throughout his entire cruise in the West Indies, Wilkes almost constantly asserted that if he could obtain a larger force of faster and more efficient vessels, he would have little or no trouble in catching the *Alabama* and the *Florida* and in putting an end to violations of the blockade. In fact, at one time, January 2, 1863, he had become so concerned about this matter that he dispatched three letters to Welles deploring the inadequacy of his squadron. His plan for his vessels to cruise in pairs made it necessary for him to have a larger force if he was to have any success in his dual objective. He repeatedly complained to the Navy Department concerning the poor condition of the ships of his squadron, and almost constantly, it seems, he received reports from his officers emphasizing the need of either repairs or complete overhauls for their ships.¹⁵

¹³ Welles to Wilkes, September 8, 9, 1862, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. I, pp. 470-71, 472; Welles to G. J. Pendergrast, August 29, 1861, *ibid.*, Ser. I, Vol. VI, pp. 145-46.

¹⁴ London *Daily News*, quoted in Richmond *Daily Enquirer*, November 18, 1862; London *Times*, October 4, 1862.

¹⁵ Wilkes to Welles, January 2, 1863, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. II, pp. 4-5, 5-7, 7-8. Many more examples might be cited.

Wilkes contended that none of his cruisers was fully capable of performing the tasks assigned to it and that this accounted for the inefficiency of his squadron. Moreover, he accused Welles of sending him the "worst vessels" possible, instead of the twelve good ships allegedly promised.¹⁶ Because of Wilkes' protests, there was a constant shifting and replacement of his vessels in an attempt to get a more seaworthy force, but, ironically enough, many of these reinforcements were often materially weak.¹⁷ It is significant to point out that despite Wilkes' many implications and accusations, the Navy Department was not actually discriminating against him. In many of his letters and in his *Diary*, Secretary Welles expressed his willingness to increase the forces of Wilkes if the Department could only have obtained additional ships.¹⁸

Wilkes' problem of an inadequate force for his mission in the West Indies caused him to commit two untoward acts, each of which brought the disfavor of the Navy Department upon him. The first of these was the detention and attachment to his squadron for more than three months of the U.S.S. *Vanderbilt*, in derogation of explicit orders for her commander to proceed to the Brazilian coast, where the Confederate warships were expected, and where they actually arrived while Wilkes was using the *Vanderbilt* elsewhere.¹⁹ Wilkes assumed command of this speedy, almost luxurious, vessel, because, as he contended, he had no other ship available for an important service at that time. Welles accused him of having made the transfer to the *Vanderbilt* merely because he found that ship to be commodious and comfortable.

¹⁶ Wilkes to Welles, December 31, 1862, *ibid.*, Ser. I, Vol. I, p. 606; Wilkes Autobiography, X, 2401, 2403.

¹⁷ See, for example, Commander G. M. Ransom of the *Mercedita* to Wilkes, June 11, 1863, and J. F. Samdin, engineer of the *Juniata*, to Commander T. H. Stevens of the *Juniata*, May 27, 1863, both in Wilkes Papers.

¹⁸ *Diary of Gideon Welles*, I, 363.

¹⁹ Wilkes to Welles, March 20, 1863, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. II, p. 131; Raphael Semmes, *Service Afloat; or, The Remarkable Career of the Confederate Cruisers, Sumter and Alabama, During the War Between the States* (Baltimore, 1887), 585; Report of the Secretary of the Navy, December 7, 1863, in *House Executive Documents*, 38 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 1, pp. xxiii-xxiv.

Wilkes himself wrote: "This is the vessel for me. She has the speed and all the appliances for the comforts I am entitled to."²⁰

Wilkes' second presumptuous act while trying to strengthen his squadron was the detention and use of two of Admiral David G. Farragut's warships. When they came into his area of command, Wilkes assigned them to duty and kept them there despite the entreaties of Farragut to the Department and the orders from Welles to return the vessels to their proper commander. After a month under Wilkes' orders, the *R. R. Cuyler* returned to Farragut off Mobile. Wilkes continued to defy the Department's orders relative to the *Oneida*, and when he was superseded in June the *Oneida*, subject to his orders, was cruising among the Windward Islands.²¹

Assistant Secretary of the Navy Gustavus V. Fox called the detention of the *Vanderbilt* the "fatal mistake" in the search for the *Alabama*,²² and Wilkes' appropriation of Farragut's vessels weakened the blockade of the Gulf Coast. This perverse attitude and his disobedience of the orders of the Navy Department relative to these three ships were later presented as specific charges against him in his court-martial.

Because of the small coal capacities of his vessels, Wilkes was confronted with the difficulty of establishing coaling stations for his West Indian force. His American coaling depot, Turtle Harbor, later succeeded by Key West, was not satisfactory because of the distance to be covered and the coal consumed in steaming between his cruising grounds and that port. This made it essential for him to establish within his cruising area as many large and convenient depots as possible.²³ In doing this, however, he had to face the problems created by

²⁰ Wilkes to his wife, undated, in Wilkes Papers (Hull Collection). See also, *Diary of Gideon Welles*, I, 316; Wilkes to Welles, March 7, 1863, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. II, p. 114.

²¹ Wilkes to Commander G. F. Emmons, January 21, 1863, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. II, pp. 46-47; Wilkes to David G. Farragut, March 23, 1863, *ibid.*, 134-35; Emmons to Farragut, March 9, 1863, *ibid.*, 118; Wilkes to James L. Lardner, June 20, 1863, *ibid.*, 358.

²² Fox to Allan McLane, president of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company, June 18, 1863, *ibid.*, 356.

²³ Wilkes to Welles, March 18, 1863, *ibid.*, 128.

the prevailing rules and spirit of international law, as well as the provisions of the Queen's proclamation relative to coaling at neutral British ports. Though the British enforced a strict system for provisioning belligerents,²⁴ international law permitted the impartial sale of a limited amount of coal to either belligerent. It was a breach of law, however, for a neutral to permit a permanent depot on its shores for the constant supplying of a belligerent and for a belligerent to coal without permission.²⁵ Here was Wilkes' obstacle, for he found it necessary to establish these coal deposits for the purpose of getting a large and constant supply and to evade the local coal dealers who often sold inferior coal and placed a big discount on United States money drafts.²⁶ The restriction on belligerent coaling in British ports was enforced quite rigorously against his vessels because of the British dislike for Wilkes. For this reason and because of the various controversies that Wilkes had with the British, Welles cautioned him to enter British ports only when it was absolutely necessary.²⁷

Practically prohibited from coaling in British ports, Wilkes was soon faced with the definite necessity of getting coal depots for his ships if they were to carry on effective work. His object was to establish coaling stations where he could readily coal without purchase. Such deposits would ease his difficulties, but at the same time they would violate international law, which required that coal be purchased from neutral ports, not deposited there. In addition to the illegality of merely having coal depots on neutral territory, the use of such depots by a belligerent virtually constituted the use of that port as that belligerent's base of operations.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, Ser. I, Vol. I, pp. 326-27.

²⁵ John Bassett Moore (ed.), *A Digest of International Law*, 8 vols. (Washington, 1906), VII, 943; Charles Cheney Hyde, *International Law, Chiefly as Interpreted and Applied by the United States*, 2 vols. (Boston, 1922), II, 717-19; William E. Hall, *A Treatise on International Law* (8th edition, Oxford, 1924), 723-24.

²⁶ Wilkes to Welles, March 18, 1863, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. II, p. 127; Commander E. T. Nichols of the U. S. S. *Alabama* to Wilkes, January 14, 1863, in Wilkes Papers.

²⁷ Welles to Wilkes, December 2, 1862, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. I, pp. 569-70.

By the time that Wilkes was replaced in the West Indies, he had set up coaling stations at Key West, Havana, Cape Haitien, St. Thomas, Curaçao, Pointe à Pitre, Santiago de Cuba, Cienfuegos, and San Juan.²⁸ These coal deposits in Spanish, French, and Danish ports were illegal according to the spirit of existing international law—illegal even if the colonial authorities gave him permission to establish permanent coal depots. Later, this same practice was protested against by the United States in the Geneva arbitration. It was claimed at that time that one supply of coal to a Confederate cruiser from a British port turned that port into that cruiser's "base of operations."²⁹

The primary objective of Wilkes in the West Indies was the capture of the *Alabama* and the *Florida*, the most famous of the Confederacy's commerce-destroyers. He failed to apprehend these so-called "pirates" despite the fact that he scoured the West Indies in search of them for almost nine months. Perhaps the cause of his failure was that his force, as he claimed, was too small and deficient; perhaps it was the shrewdness of the commanders of the Confederate warships, Raphael Semmes and J. Newland Maffitt; or it might have been, though it is questionable, that the Confederates were given too much illegal aid by colonial authorities in the West Indies. Undoubtedly each of these factors played some part in denying Wilkes what would have been the supreme event of his life. Instead of winning such a laurel, he returned to the United States practically in disgrace and certainly in defeat. He was satisfied, however, that "all was done that could be effected."³⁰

Wilkes was at a disadvantage, to a degree, in his search for the *Alabama* and the *Florida* because of Semmes' and Maffitt's familiarity with the passages and ports in the West Indies. He soon found that "it was utterly impossible to blockade one of their vessels in any port of the West Indies and when it was attempted it invariably failed as they could easily escape in the darkness and avail themselves of the small passages but if blockaded by two vessels or three if need be there

²⁸ Wilkes to Lardner, June 20, 1863, *ibid.*, Ser. I, Vol. II, pp. 359-60.

²⁹ Hall, *International Law*, 724.

³⁰ Wilkes Autobiography, X, 2352.

were many chances to insure their capture."⁸¹ This system of cruising in pairs while sweeping through the West Indies, as well as his plan of sending ships posthaste to the spot where the Confederate vessels were last seen, failed.

On the other hand, Wilkes had the advantages of having a more stable government, with unlimited resources, behind him, of being the pursuer rather than the pursued (if the two commerce-raiders could be called such), and of having much less to lose than did the Confederates in the event of any disaster. One very important source of aid to Wilkes was that of the United States consular staff, particularly in the West Indies. From the members of this group, as well as from other individuals, Wilkes, either directly or through the Navy Department, was constantly getting information relative to the movements and supposed plans of the *Alabama* and the *Florida*, as well as of contra-band-carriers and blockade-runners.⁸²

Wilkes followed the *Alabama*, particularly, much of the time during his nine months' cruise in the West Indies, but he was never able to come into actual contact with her to attempt her capture. He found this cruising in the West Indies, covering some thirty-one specific cruising stations, to be "by no means a pleasant employment."⁸³ Steaming from island to island, attempting to cover the entire area under his command, and acting upon false rumors were an energy and time-consuming activity. In addition to this never-ceasing duty, he was confronted with the problems of an inadequate force and the lack of convenient coaling stations. More demoralizing, however, were the almost constant complaints from Spain, France, Denmark, Mexico, and particularly Great Britain, which accused him of arrogance, infringement upon the neutrality of their respective countries, and various other illegal acts. In addition to this handicap, his attention was

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 2404.

⁸² See Letters to Flag Officers and Commandants of Vessels, Vol. 2, *passim*.

⁸³ Memorandum, List of Cruising Stations of the West India Squadron, undated, in Wilkes Papers; Wilkes Autobiography, X, 2494.

diverted from his major objective by the emphasis he placed upon his attempt to break up the activities of blockade-runners and contraband-carriers.

By mid-December, 1862, Welles was decidedly exasperated at Wilkes' lack of success against the Confederate cruisers and irritated by the press criticism of himself and the Navy Department. Welles, susceptible to the criticism of the newspapers, reacted by sending Wilkes peremptory orders criticizing his failure. On December 15, he wrote Wilkes that it was desirable to break up blockade-running from the West Indies, but that the imperative duty was the destruction of the *Alabama* and the *Florida*. There is no doubt that Wilkes had been making better progress against the blockade-runners than against the commerce-destroyers. Welles, however, complained to Wilkes that he was giving too much attention to the former and still was having little success against them. This, then, he contended, certainly was no excuse for not concentrating his attention upon the commerce-raiders.³⁴

The naval secretary suspected that Wilkes was obsessed with the desire to make a personal financial profit out of the capture of blockade-runners and that therefore he found it more worth while to concentrate on that activity and to relegate his pursuit of the *Alabama* and the *Florida* to a position of secondary importance.³⁵ There is some evidence to substantiate this suspicion. Wilkes informed his wife that he was "filling his pockets" from the admiral's share of one-twentieth of all of the prize money coming to his squadron. The amount of money that he received from this source was unquestionably large.³⁶

Though quite interested in seizing prizes, Wilkes did not abandon his chase of the Confederate warships. He continued his vain pursuit by following every possible clue, checking up on every rumor concerning the Confederates, and attempting to look in at all their possible

³⁴ Welles to Wilkes, December 15, 1862, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. I, p. 588.

³⁵ *Diary of Gideon Welles*, I, 217.

³⁶ Wilkes to his wife, March 23, 1863, in Wilkes Papers (Hull Collection); Wilkes Diary, January 10, 14, 19, April 14, 1863; June 11, 1864.

coaling, refitting, and provisioning ports. He watched the British ports particularly closely, since he was convinced that the British were the most active in giving aid to Semmes and Maffitt. He was never able to report his failure to capture the Confederates without accusing the colonial officials in the West Indies of giving undue assistance to the Southerners. The persistency of these complaints convinced Welles of illegal British activities but did not excuse Wilkes' lack of success. Wilkes often protested directly to British colonial officials, particularly the governors of Nassau and Barbados, concerning their aid to the Confederates in violation of the Queen's proclamation of neutrality.⁸⁷ While Wilkes' vessels cruised between the various British ports and hovered outside those which were suspected of giving the greatest aid to the Confederates, they were at the same time put in an advantageous position for watching the ingress and egress of vessels suspected of being blockade-runners. This illegal practice of "hovering," however, often brought Wilkes into verbal and written disputes with various colonial authorities in the West Indies.

Pressed on by Welles, Wilkes made the most of the means afforded him and continued his search for the Confederate vessels. By the latter part of March, 1863, he reported that he was narrowing down their area of operations and that he would soon make them quit the West Indies or capture them. In support of this boast, he said that the southern commanders were having a difficult time and were finding it necessary to resort to subterfuges, with the aid of colonial officials, in order to escape the ships of his squadron. By now, Wilkes' plan was to guard those points where the raiders commonly resorted to waylay commercial craft as well as watching their possible coaling places.⁸⁸

Irked by public criticism of the Navy Department, disgusted with Wilkes' continued failure to apprehend the southern warships, and irritated by his detention of the *Vanderbilt* which ruined the plans

⁸⁷ Wilkes to Welles, March 7, 12, 1863, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. II, pp. 113-15, 118-19; Wilkes to Governor James Walker of Barbados, March 6, 1863, *ibid.*, 116; Wilkes to Welles, May 13, 1863, *ibid.*, 184-85.

⁸⁸ Wilkes to Welles, April 3, 1863, *ibid.*, 141-42.

which might possibly have led to the capture of the Confederates off Brazil, Welles decided to relieve Wilkes. Said Welles: "The accounts of piratical depredations disturb me. My views, instructions, and arrangements to capture the *Alabama*, which would have prevented these depredations, have failed through the misconduct of Wilkes."³⁹ Wilkes, on the other hand, later blamed his lack of success on Welles' ignorance and lack of support. He contended that his plans for capturing the *Alabama*, plans which Welles had approved and had organized the "Flying Squadron" to accomplish, would have succeeded, if properly carried out, in cutting off all retreats of the Confederates. Moreover, he was sure that it was his activities that had caused these vessels to leave the West Indies and seek prey elsewhere.⁴⁰

Wilkes did display efficiency and energy in seizing certain blockade-runners, despite his many obstacles and disadvantages, and he met with fair success in his efforts to put an end to the use of intermediary ports in Mexico from which contraband would be relayed to Texas. The other practice, that of transshipping in the West Indies and then proceeding directly to one of the nearer southern ports, was too extensive for Wilkes to make much headway against it. Out of his attempt to combat this broken-voyage practice came the cases of the *Peterhoff*, *Springbok*, and *Dolphin*, which have since become significant in maritime law on blockade and contraband. Each of these seizures provoked heated protests from the British, who contended that these vessels were engaged in a legitimate trade and were illegally seized.⁴¹ Similarly, the Danish officials at St. Thomas complained because they considered that Wilkes had violated Danish maritime neutrality in the case of the *Peterhoff*.⁴² The American lower courts upheld Wilkes' actions and

³⁹ *Diary of Gideon Welles*, I, 327.

⁴⁰ Wilkes *Autobiography*, X, 2407-2408, 2504.

⁴¹ Lord Lyons, British minister to the United States, to Seward, February 25, 1863, in *Notes from the British Embassy* (Division of State Department Archives, The National Archives), Vol. 48; Lyons to Seward, March 26, 1863, *ibid*.

⁴² Lieutenant Governor Louis Rothe of St. Thomas to Lieutenant Commander Charles E. Fleming of the *Wachusett*, April 13, 1863, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. II, pp. 150-51.

his applied theory of seizing vessels, on either leg of the journey, that were engaged in ultimate destination or continuous voyage trade. The Supreme Court, in hearing the appeals of the *Peterhoff* and the *Springbok* in 1866, did not wish to enlarge too greatly upon a belligerent's use of a blockade, and it reversed the decisions as to the ship but affirmed them as to the cargo on the grounds of contraband.⁴³

The seizure of the *Peterhoff* by the orders of Wilkes brought down upon his head a great storm of protest from the British and bade fair to assume the "alarming aspects" of the *Trent* affair until it was finally adjudicated. British commercial interests, the general public, and the British press were indignant over the seizure of their vessels. One of the major causes of their cry of rage was the fear that Wilkes would continue, in similar acts, what they termed the arbitrary arrest of British ships and thus extend the Federal blockade even into the West Indies. The Law Officers of the Crown, in declaring the seizure of the *Peterhoff* illegal, said that the British West India Squadron would be ordered to protect the trade with Mexico from a repetition of that act. Parliament was stirred by belligerent speeches, some even hinting war to put down American insolence, and Seward was again severely criticized for sending Wilkes to such an area of command when it was known that he had so great a hatred for England.⁴⁴

The seizure of the British ship *Dolphin* in March, 1863, was denounced even more than that of the *Peterhoff*. It was felt that such cases as those of the *Dolphin*, *Peterhoff*, and *Springbok*, as well as other seizures, were not to be considered as isolated acts but rather as a premeditated policy of the United States. This was felt to be true especially since the acts were committed by Wilkes. Earl Russell, Brit-

⁴³ Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Division of International Law, *Prize Cases Decided in the United States Supreme Court, 1789-1918*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1923), III, 1609-28; Moore (ed.), *Digest of International Law*, VII, 700-730.

⁴⁴ London *Morning Post*, March 27, 1863, quoted in Washington *Daily National Intelligence*, April 13, 1863; London *Times*, March 27, April 2, 8, 1863; Speeches of Mr. Roebuck in the House of Commons and Lord Clanricarde in the House of Lords, cited in Washington *Daily National Intelligence*, May 7, 1863; New York *Times*, May 7, 1863.

ish Foreign Secretary, was much more moderate, however, than the British public and press, though just as persistent, in his protests.⁴⁵

The seizure of the English vessel *Victor* by one of Wilkes' cruisers late in May, 1863, brought about diplomatic representations from Great Britain and Spain because of the alleged violation of Spanish maritime jurisdiction. Lord Lyons, the British minister to the United States, and Gabriel García y Tassara, the Spanish minister, entered heated protests, the former including a complaint against Wilkes' tactics which were allegedly tending to make the neutral port of Havana a base of operations for American warships.⁴⁶

Wilkes followed the blockade-runners around the West Indies as they changed their concentration bases from one port to another. He was successful in causing them to shift their bases and to resort to more subterfuges to evade capture; he was successful in irritating them, as Welles said, and he was successful in getting quite some money for the admiral's share of the prizes, as he somewhat boastfully told his wife. By no means, however, did he succeed in completely cutting off blockade-running at its West Indian source. Even a marked decrease in this activity as a result of his campaign against it might well be disputed. The magnitude and profits of blockade-running probably made complete success against it an impossibility.

Wilkes not only failed in the services which he had been ordered to perform, but at the same time he also created a greater problem for himself and for his government in the hostility which he aroused by his illegal and arrogant actions in the West Indies. His attitude and acts brought forth numerous and persistent complaints from many of

⁴⁵ Consul Thomas H. Dudley to Seward, April 25, 1863, in Consular Letters, Liverpool (Division of State Department Archives, The National Archives), Vol. 23, No. 67; *New York Times*, May 7, 1863; *Washington Daily National Intelligencer*, May 5, 1863; Lyons to Seward, April 29, 1863, in Notes from the British Embassy, Vol. 50; Lyons to Seward, May 4, 7, 1863, *ibid.*, Vol. 51. The decision in the case of the *Dolphin* was not appealed.

⁴⁶ Lyons to Seward, July 17, 1863, in Notes from the British Embassy, Vol. 53; Lyons to Seward, December 30, 1863, *ibid.*, Vol. 57; Tassara to Seward, July 7, 1863, translation, in Notes from the Spanish Embassy (Division of State Department Archives, The National Archives), Vol. 19.

the colonial officials there and from some of the diplomatic agents of the various countries concerned. Wilkes was just as insistent in his counter accusations that these same authorities were too sympathetic toward the Confederacy and that they manifested this feeling in many unneutral acts. He was particularly bitter against the British, who, in turn, were the most active protestants against him. Secretary Welles favored Wilkes' readiness to make counterprotests, since he felt that the United States should adopt a firm policy of maintaining its rights.

As has been stated above, Wilkes' trouble with the British dated from the very beginning of his West Indian command. After his first contact with a British official, Governor H. St. George Ord of Bermuda, it was intimated that Seward had a "double object" in sending Wilkes there. Some felt that he was in the West Indies not only to seize vessels in British ports, but also to "insult the authorities," because of Britain's "defenceless state."⁴⁷ Ord protested to Wilkes because two of the latter's ships had allegedly engaged in the illegal act of "hovering" off the port of St. George, Bermuda, and had used that port as a base of operations by coaling there for the purpose of cruising in the neighborhood. In fact, said the governor, a practical blockade of Bermuda had been set up. Wilkes' reply was heated, particularly because the governor had told the *Tioga* never to return to those waters.⁴⁸ So strong was this counterprotest that the British called it defiance to their colonial representative.⁴⁹

Wilkes' version, however, was that he and his vessels had been ill-received and treated and that the entire action on the part of the governor was uncalled for and was caused by his Confederate sympathy.⁵⁰ Judging from Lord Lyons' official protest to the State Department in

⁴⁷ Washington *Daily National Intelligencer*, October 20, 1863, quoting a Halifax paper.

⁴⁸ H. St. George Ord to Wilkes, October 1, 1862, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. I, p. 495; Wilkes to Ord, October 1, 1862, *ibid.*, 497-98; Bermuda *Royal Gazette*, October 14, 1862, quoted in Richmond *Daily Enquirer*, November 5, 1862; London *Times*, October 28, 1862.

⁴⁹ Lyons to Seward, November 24, 1862, in Notes from the British Embassy, Vol. 47.

⁵⁰ Wilkes to Welles, January 2, 1863, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. II, pp. 8-9.

regard to this affair, Governor Ord's account must have been somewhat different and certainly more passionate than that of Wilkes. Lyons said that Wilkes was reported to him not only by the civil governor but also by the British military and naval officials at Bermuda. He disliked Wilkes' obvious defiance of the proper authority of the governor of Bermuda in refusing to abide by the law on coaling. Accordingly, his protestation of November 24, 1862, was in no uncertain terms and was indeed quite strong when one considers the usual terms of diplomatic intercourse and the rather delicate condition of Anglo-American relations at that time. Said Lyons:

The Government of the United States cannot have intended that the governor was to be instructed in the performance of his duties, but the words of Rear Admiral Wilkes seem to imply that he meant to attempt it.

In these several points I am ordered to address a strong remonstrance to the Government of the United States; and I am directed to express the regret of Her Majesty's Government that Rear Admiral Wilkes, who treats with contempt the lawful orders issued by the duly constituted Authorities of the British Crown, should have been appointed to a command in which he could not fail to be brought into contact with these Authorities.⁵¹

In reply to the request that the American Government restrain Wilkes from a repetition of those tactics against which Lyons was complaining, Seward merely promised to investigate the actions in order to obtain observance of international law and comity.⁵² Welles, with his anti-British attitude, in general supported Wilkes, and in his reply to Seward's inquiry he made such a strong case for Wilkes that one would think that Wilkes was insulted rather than being insulting.⁵³ Seward then told Lyons that the whole affair was a misunderstanding, but that his government would be glad to investigate any claims of conduct other than that to which its officers had been ordered to conform.⁵⁴

⁵¹ Lyons to Seward, November 24, 1862, in *Notes from the British Embassy*, Vol. 47.

⁵² Seward to Lyons, November 24, 1862, in *Notes to the British Embassy* (Division of State Department Archives, The National Archives), Vol. 9, p. 348.

⁵³ Welles to Seward, December 2, 1862, in *Miscellaneous Letters*, Department of State (Division of State Department Archives, The National Archives).

⁵⁴ Seward to Lyons, December 5, 1862, in *Notes to the British Embassy*, Vol. 9, pp. 359-64.

In mid-November, Wilkes again aroused British ire when he established a virtual blockade of Nassau. When Wilkes remarked that he would anchor off that port if he saw fit to do so, without any reference to the governor's wishes or prohibition, Captain Malcolm of the British warship *Barracouta* announced that he would fire at once if this were done.⁵⁵ An even more threatening incident occurred shortly afterward. As Wilkes' ship was getting under way from Stirrup Cays, the *Barracouta* was seen and recognized. The two vessels, according to Wilkes, then bore down upon each other, both with their crews at quarters and prepared for action. They hove to and observed each other from a distance of a quarter of a mile for about twenty-five minutes. The British ship finally left. Wilkes reported:

I have no idea what the captain of the *Barracouta's* intention was, but I prepared the *Wachusett* for any contingency, and was ready to encounter any. I shall be overcautious to avoid being the first to break the peace; you may be assured of this, but if any one should take upon themselves to break it or do insult to our flag, they must take the consequences. The *Barracouta* is a much heavier armed vessel than the *Wachusett*, but that is of little consequence. You may depend on it, we shall fight with a good will.⁵⁶

Though often irritated by various questionable activities of Wilkes in the West Indies, the diplomatic Vice Admiral Alexander Milne, commander of the British West India Fleet, handled these troublesome situations with "consummate tact."⁵⁷ He reported to Lyons concerning the incident at Nassau and censured Wilkes' actions there.⁵⁸ Diplomatic correspondence ensued when Wilkes was thus reported for a second time concerning arrogant and questionable acts. Welles again upheld Wilkes, and to the British complaints Seward merely replied that Wilkes had been instructed to give to British naval officers all

⁵⁵ Samuel Whiting, United States consul at Nassau, to Wilkes, November 23, 1862, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. I, p. 555.

⁵⁶ Wilkes to Welles, December 4, 1862, *ibid.*, 571. See also, Wilkes Diary, November 27, 1862.

⁵⁷ James P. Baxter, 3rd, "The British Government and Neutral Rights, 1861-1865," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XXXIV (1928-1929), 21.

⁵⁸ Lyons to Seward, January 20, 1863, in Notes from the British Embassy, Vol. 48.

courtesies due them on any occasion of intercourse.⁵⁹ It is interesting to note that in none of the diplomatic correspondence was any mention made of Wilkes' report of the near-breach of peace in the *Barracouta* incident off Stirrup Cays. Similarly, the only comments passed on to Wilkes were that he was to avoid visiting British ports and that he should try to cultivate amicable relations with the British.⁶⁰ Nevertheless, shortly after this Milne again complained to Lyons concerning the alleged illegal capture of the *Elias Reed* and the *Mont Blanc*, English merchantmen, and the violation of British waters by Wilkes' gunboats. Because of Lyons' protest on these cases and the arrival of British reinforcements in the West Indies, many peculiar rumors concerning Wilkes went abroad. Some even suggested that the British naval officers had orders to make him a prisoner.⁶¹

Wilkes' next diplomatic controversies were with the French, Mexicans, and Danes. So close a watch did he maintain over the French island of Martinique, which he understood to be a Confederate base, that the governor there protested in the latter part of April, 1863, against the "species of blockade" that he was enforcing and which the governor would not allow, and against a procedure which was making St. Pierre a base of operations for Wilkes. He assured the governor that he would not violate the maritime waters of France by a naval engagement.⁶² Writing a few years later, however, Wilkes gave a different version of his respect for French maritime jurisdiction. At this later time he stated that because he considered the Confederate cruisers

⁵⁹ Welles to Seward, December 15, 1862, in *Miscellaneous Letters*, Department of State, December, 1862; Welles to Seward, January 6, 1863, *ibid.*, January, 1863; Seward to Lyons, December 16, 1862, in *Notes to the British Embassy*, Vol. 9, pp. 375-76; Seward to Lyons, January 20, February 7, 1863, *ibid.*, 421, 434.

⁶⁰ Welles to Wilkes, January 8, 14, 1863, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. II, pp. 12, 24.

⁶¹ Milne to Lyons, December 16, 1862, *ibid.*, 13-14, enclosure in Welles to Wilkes, January 8, 1863; Lyons to Seward, January 9, 1863, in *Notes from the British Embassy*, Vol. 48; *Bahama Herald*, January 17, 1863, quoted in *New York Times*, January 27, 1863; *New York Times*, April 16, 1863.

⁶² Governor of Martinique to Nichols of the U. S. S. *Alabama*, April 28, 1863, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. II, p. 189, enclosed in Wilkes to Welles, May 13, 1863, *ibid.*, 184-88.

as pirates he would have disregarded the question of the neutrality of the port in which he found them—be it English, French, Spanish, or Danish.⁶³

The Mexicans entered a strong protest against what they contended was unmitigated aggression when Wilkes allegedly took from the jurisdiction of the Mexican tribunals the *Virginia*, or *Noe Daquy*. Wilkes claimed that the *Virginia* was a Confederate vessel, though at this time the Mexican courts were adjudicating as to whether or not she was a Spanish slaver.⁶⁴ The Mexican minister at Washington protested that Wilkes' actions were illegal and that his conduct was "not merely . . . contrary to the teachings of international law, but . . . an open violation of the Sovereignty of Mexico." The Spanish minister declared that this seizure of a Spanish vessel was a "flagrantly arbitrary act."⁶⁵

Denmark was another of those nations that protested against the illegal acts of Wilkes while he was in the West Indies. At first Lieutenant Governor Louis Rothe of St. Thomas, Danish West Indies, made his complaints directly to Wilkes. Finding this method to be of no avail, the Danish Government then protested to the State Department. In such grievances Lord Lyons supported the Danes, because it was at St. Thomas that Wilkes' "hovering" tactics were successful in seizing certain alleged British blockade-runners. It was off this port that both the *Peterhoff* and the *Dolphin* were taken as prizes.

Wilkes often used St. Thomas as his rendezvous while he was in the West Indies, and later in his command there he made it a coaling station. Rothe was generally uneasy lest the neutrality of St. Thomas be infringed upon by Wilkes' warships,⁶⁶ since this island was a known base for blockade-runners. Wilkes promised Rothe that except in the case of the *Florida* or the *Alabama* he would exercise his belligerent

⁶³ Wilkes Autobiography, X, 2352-54, 2411-13.

⁶⁴ Wilkes to Welles, January 18, 1863, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. II, pp. 41-42; Matías Romero, Mexican minister to United States, to Seward, February 23, 1863, *ibid.*, 43; Romero to Seward, March 6, 1863, in Notes from the Mexican Legation (Division of State Department Archives, The National Archives), Vol. 12.

⁶⁵ Romero to Seward, April 15, 1863, in Notes from the Mexican Legation, Vol. 12; Tassara to Seward, March 15, 1863, in Notes from the Spanish Embassy, Vol. 18.

⁶⁶ Wilkes Autobiography, X, 2414.

right of capture only after vessels were on the high seas. He stated that if these latter ships contained no contraband, they need have no fear of seizure; otherwise, he said, he had a right to take them as prizes. "Therefore," said Wilkes, "whether we lay at anchor or cruised off the port was of no consequence."⁶⁷ This, however, constituted the "hovering" tactics against which the British had protested and the Danes were to protest in forceful terms.

Rothe's first complaint was on April 9, 1863, when he protested to Wilkes about his cruisers using the port of St. Thomas as a base from which to make preparations to overhaul and seize vessels going in or out of the harbor. Rothe objected to such tactics at St. Thomas as illegal and as an infringement on the free egress and ingress of vessels and on the best interests of the port.⁶⁸ The commander of the *Wachusett*, which had been stationed at St. Thomas, denied that any United States warships had remained at St. Thomas for the purpose of "originating or making preparations for overhauling and pursuing vessels" going in or out of that harbor.⁶⁹ Wilkes, however, had written Welles earlier that the *Wachusett* had been stationed at St. Thomas "to watch the exit of contraband runners then in port, and endeavor to capture them when outside the neutral limits."⁷⁰ Then on May 13, 1863, Wilkes gave Rothe positive assurances that Danish neutrality had not been violated in the past, either in the case of the *Dolphin* or of the *Peterhoff*, and that it would be respected in the future.⁷¹ Though this correspondence was carried on in friendly terms, and the governor had admitted that there were possible misconceptions in the case, he had already complained to the Danish home government.

Edward, Count Piper, minister-resident of Norway and Sweden, was at that time the diplomatic representative of Denmark in the United States, and he forwarded to Seward a friendly but positive complaint

⁶⁷ Wilkes to Welles, March 20, 1863, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. II, p. 130. See also, Wilkes Autobiography, X, 2415.

⁶⁸ Rothe to Wilkes, April 6, 1863, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. II, p. 149.

⁶⁹ Fleming to Rothe, April 11, 1863, *ibid.*, 150.

⁷⁰ Wilkes to Welles, March 20, 1863, *ibid.*, 130.

⁷¹ Wilkes to Rothe, May 13, 1863, *ibid.*, 152-54.

against the illegal use of St. Thomas by Wilkes' ships.⁷² After Seward made a somewhat elaborate promise to respect Danish neutrality,⁷³ the Danish Government dropped the subject. The English, however, whose merchantmen Wilkes had seized off St. Thomas, pursued the question vigorously. Vice Admiral Milne sent Lyons several complaints relative to Wilkes' unethical practices.⁷⁴ These notes, of which Wilkes was aware, in addition to the correspondence between Milne and himself, convinced him that it was these complaints and Lyons' subsequent protests that led to his recall from the command of the "Flying Squadron."⁷⁵ Welles answered the protests evasively, but he did state that now the law would be enforced "as far as practicable," since Wilkes had been replaced, and his successor had been instructed against the use of neutral waters or shores for belligerent purposes.⁷⁶ Seward used this information as the basis of his reply to Lyons,⁷⁷ who was apparently satisfied, particularly by the notice of Wilkes' replacement.

Acting Rear Admiral Wilkes was recalled from duty in the West Indies on June 1, 1863, and was superseded by Acting Rear Admiral James L. Lardner, the transfer of command taking place at St. Thomas on June 30, 1863.⁷⁸ Wilkes said that he was glad to be replaced, since he was now free to return to his family in Washington, but he lamented the fact that conditions surrounding this action tended to do him an injustice.⁷⁹

⁷² Translation, enclosed in Seward to Welles, June 5, 1863, in Executive Letters, Navy Department (Naval Records Collection of the Office of Naval Records and Library, The National Archives), June, 1863, No. 15.

⁷³ Seward to Count Piper, June 9, 1863, in Notes to the Swedish Embassy (Division of State Department Archives, The National Archives), Vol. 6, p. 118.

⁷⁴ Lyons to Seward, June 16, 1863, in Notes from the British Embassy, Vol. 52; Lyons to Seward, June 18, 1863, *ibid.*, Vol. 53; Seward to Lyons, June 25, 1863, in Notes to the British Embassy, Vol. 10, p. 121.

⁷⁵ Wilkes Diary, June 18, July 8, 1863; Wilkes Autobiography, X, 2505, 2614-15.

⁷⁶ Welles to Seward, July 25, 1863, in Miscellaneous Letters, Department of State, July, 1863.

⁷⁷ Seward to Lyons, July 29, 1863, in Notes to the British Embassy, Vol. 10, pp. 175-76.

⁷⁸ Welles to Wilkes, June 1, 1863, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. II, p. 253; Wilkes to Welles, June 20, 1863, *ibid.*, 358.

⁷⁹ Wilkes Diary, June 17, 1863; Wilkes to his wife, June 27, 1863, in Wilkes Papers (Hull Collection).

Wilkes' recall may be attributed to three primary factors: his detention of the *Vanderbilt* in derogation of her specific orders; his failure in his primary mission, the capture of the *Alabama*; and the persistent complaints and protests of various neutral powers against his alleged illegal and 'arrogant acts while on his cruising station. The last of these probably had the most weight. Spain, Mexico, Denmark, France, and particularly Great Britain, complained at one time or another against certain actions of Wilkes. So alarming did the British protests grow, from the very outspoken note of Lyons of November 24, 1862, the diplomatic protests relative to the seizure of the *Peterhoff*, *Springbok*, and *Dolphin*, and the somewhat critical condition as a result of Wilkes' illegal use of St. Thomas, that Seward prevailed upon Welles to recall Wilkes, and he suggested that Welles use as an explanation Wilkes' interference with the Department's plans relative to the *Vanderbilt*.⁸⁰ Wilkes himself was convinced that his detachment from the West India Squadron came as a result of British diplomatic pressure.

In reply to Welles' annual report, in which Wilkes was severely criticized for detaining the *Vanderbilt* at a moment critical in the pursuit of the *Alabama*, Wilkes wrote a strong letter of protest to the Secretary of the Navy.⁸¹ This letter was obtained in some undeterminable manner and printed in several daily newspapers on December 18, 1863. A court of inquiry, called by Welles, asserted that this letter had been published with the knowledge or consent of Wilkes.⁸² Welles then found it necessary, because of this decision, to bring Wilkes to a naval general court-martial, since such action was contrary to naval regulations.

In March, 1864, Wilkes was brought to trial upon five charges, with several specifications substantiating them. He was charged with disobedience of orders, insubordinate conduct, disrespect to his superior officer, disobedience to a general naval regulation, and conduct unbecom-

⁸⁰ *Diary of Gideon Welles*, I, 298, 304-305.

⁸¹ Report of the Secretary of the Navy, December 7, 1863, in *House Exec. Docs.*, 38 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 1, pp. xxiii-xxiv; Wilkes to Welles, December 11, 1863, in *Official Records, Navies*, Ser. I, Vol. II, pp. 567-69.

⁸² Proceedings of Commodore Charles Wilkes' Court of Inquiry, in *House Exec. Docs.*, 38 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 103, pp. 18-20.

ing an officer. Though Wilkes objected to the personnel of the court, as, he said, it was composed of men inimical to him, and though he plead his innocence, he was found guilty on all five counts and sentenced to be publicly reprimanded and suspended from the navy for three years.⁸³ Fortunately for Wilkes, his lawyers, who were also successful politicians, were able to prevail upon Lincoln to remit two years of this sentence, much to Welles' disgust.⁸⁴ As Wilkes' suspension did not end until May, 1865, he was engaged in no further Civil War service, although on being reinstated he was commissioned rear admiral on the retired list.⁸⁵

⁸³ Commodore Charles Wilkes' Court-Martial, *ibid.*, 38 Cong., 1 Sess., No. 102.

⁸⁴ Wilkes Diary, May-December, 1864, *passim*; *Diary of Gideon Welles*, II, 203; Welles to Wilkes, December 30, 1864, in Appointments, Orders, and Resignations, Navy Department, Vol. 36, p. 40.

⁸⁵ Welles to Wilkes, August 6, 1866, in Appointments, Orders, and Resignations, Navy Department, Vol. 37, p. 516.

The Louisiana Unification Movement of 1873

BY T. HARRY WILLIAMS

In the early months of 1873 conditions in "reconstructed" Louisiana verged on anarchy. To all outward appearances, carpetbag-Republican government and its political reflex, intransigent white-Democratic opposition, had divided the state into two sullen, bitter camps of racial and political hatred. In one, the Republican, were the great mass of the Negroes and their white leaders, and sometimes exploiters, the carpetbaggers and scalawags. In the other, the Democratic or conservative, were most of the whites, especially those in the country parishes. The Democrats had made a supreme effort in the election of 1872 to gain control of the state. They claimed that they had elected their candidate, John McEnery, to the governorship. The Republicans claimed the same thing for their man, William P. Kellogg. The federal government, acting in a spirit more partisan than objective, resolved the dispute by installing Kellogg with federal bayonets.¹ To the Democrats the Kellogg government was a rank usurpation. Many refused to pay taxes to it. McEnery, announcing that he was governor, issued proclamations and instructed Democratic legislators not to attend the sessions of the Kellogg legislature.² Savage violence gripped the state. One bitter indi-

¹ Deciding the victor in the election of 1872 would have puzzled even a Solomon. Both parties were guilty of fraud and falsification of the vote, but the federal government controlled by the Republican party, accepted the verdict of the election furnished by the Louisiana Republicans.

² This summary of political events is based upon an examination of New Orleans papers for 1872 and 1873. For an account of the election of 1872 and Kellogg's governorship, see John E. Gonzales, "William Pitt Kellogg: Reconstruction Governor of Louisiana" (M. A. thesis, Louisiana State University, 1945).

vidual tried to assassinate Kellogg, Republican officials received threatening letters, tension between the races culminated in bloody clashes and riots, and mob action seemed the order of the day.³

Such conditions naturally had an adverse effect upon the state's economic development. Business and trade languished, and capital investment was retarded. At least so thought many business men of New Orleans, who had seen their city torn by brawls and killings and who believed the great port metropolis needed political stability to achieve economic prosperity. Crying for a return to the ways of peace, one newspaper wailed, "What a reputation is that for a city to have abroad; and how can we expect to prosper politically, or commercially, under such circumstances?"⁴

In this convulsed and uncertain hour of Louisiana's Reconstruction history, a group of whites and Negroes in New Orleans came forward with a plan to compose the differences agitating the state and to end at one blow the process of Reconstruction. They proposed to unify the two races into one gigantic political organization that, sweeping everything before it, would gain control of the state government and restore harmony and stability. They proposed to guarantee to the Negro complete political, civil, and, if possible, economic equality. The white sponsors of the plan represented the flower of the wealth and culture of New Orleans. They called their project the "Unification Movement." It seems to have escaped the notice of historians of Reconstruction and the state.⁵

The origins of the unification movement were in the election of 1872. In that year a group of New Orleans conservatives organized to achieve a reform of the city government. They soon decided that it was fruitless to work for improvement of the municipal administration as long as the

³ The New Orleans *Times*, May 8, 1873, contains six columns of reports of such assorted violent events throughout the state.

⁴ New Orleans *Daily Crescent City*, quoted in Opelousas *Journal*, June 7, 1873. See also New Orleans *Republican*, May 18, 1873.

⁵ The only mention of the unification movement to be found in the secondary works dealing with Louisiana and Reconstruction is a slighting reference of one sentence in Alcée Fortier, *A History of Louisiana*, 4 vols. (New York, 1904), IV, part 2, pp. 134-35.

state government was corrupt. Expanding their objectives, they created the Reform party, dedicated to honest, economical state government, and invited the support of like-minded people throughout the state. The guiding spirits of the party were Isaac N. Marks and William M. Randolph, of whom more later; it was almost entirely a New Orleans movement, drawing but small support in the country parishes. Eventually the Reform group fused with the Democrats or conservatives in the hope of thus defeating the Republicans and corruption. Noteworthy in the Reform campaign was the emphasis placed by the leaders upon better race relations. They invited Negroes to places on committees and to their rallies. They stressed the necessity of friendship between the races and advocated acceptance of the Negro's political and civil rights as guaranteed by the Fifteenth Amendment. The Reform platform recognized in extremely general terms the legal equality of the races.⁶ The overtures of the Reformers attracted some Negroes to the party. The colored people had a real admiration for Marks, whom they considered a sincere champion of their race. The sincerity of some of the other Reformers they doubted, and the vague terms of the platform repelled them. Therefore the Reformers failed to secure any mass Negro support.⁷ After the Reformers fused with the Democrats, they dropped their emphasis on race co-operation to concentrate on defeating the Republicans. The Reform leaders, however, had become convinced that the salvation of Louisiana lay in a political union of the races, and in the dark days of 1873 they turned again to their ideas of the previous year. They brought forth now a specific and detailed plan to combine the races and dignified it with the new name of "Unification."

⁶ *Appleton's American Annual Cyclopedia* (New York, 1862-1903), XII (1872), 474; Ella Lonn, *Reconstruction in Louisiana after 1868* (New York, 1918), 140-41, 154; Henry C. Warmoth, *War, Politics, and Reconstruction: Stormy Days in Louisiana* (New York, 1930), 178; *New Orleans Daily Picayune*, December 2, 1871, February 18, 1872, May 23, 1873 (letter by "Conservative"); *New Orleans Times*, February 18, June 5, 6, 7, 1872.

⁷ *New Orleans Republican*, January 12, 15 (letter by J. Henri Burch), July 24, 1873; *New Orleans Times*, May 28 (interview with a Negro leader), May 29 (interview with a Reform leader). It is to be noted that in 1872 the Democrats also accepted in general terms the legal equality of the Negro. Lonn, *Reconstruction in Louisiana*, 153.

In the spring of 1873 the first hints were heard in strife-weary New Orleans that a political movement to unify the races was in the offing. The leading journalistic champion of the proposed organization was the New Orleans *Times*, conservative organ of the business interests, and the leading champion of race co-operation on the *Times* was the reporter who conducted the sprightly column of political and social gossip called "Round About Town." On March 29 "Roundabout" announced that a unification party would be formed. Immediately approving letters flooded his column.

Claiming that he spoke for the young men of the city, "Juvenus" described New Orleans' withering commerce, the fall of real estate values, and the decay of the sugar industry. These sad conditions, he said, made it imperatively necessary for the whites to rise "superior to past traditions, party lines, and dead or useless issues. We believe the hour has come for immediate action on a broad and liberal plane of honesty and good faith to the interests of all citizens, white and black, in Louisiana."⁸ A writer signing himself "F" said that the Negroes, disgusted with their carpetbag leaders, were anxious to enter into "an agreement with the white people by which both parties may be enabled to dwell in concord and pull together in political harness. . . . Unless the two races adopt some platform on which they can stand on friendly terms, Louisiana has nothing to look forward to but debt, dissension, anarchy."⁹ Encouraged by such approving sentiments, Roundabout proceeded to create in his column a fictitious character named Mr. Chucks, a symbol of Louisianans coming to their senses on the race issue. In his first public statement, Mr. Chucks declared that if the refusal of the whites to grant political rights to the Negroes was the cause of the prevailing commercial prostration, "why, I think we're making asses of ourselves, that's all."¹⁰

⁸ New Orleans *Times*, April 1, 1873. *Ibid.*, April 8, contains a similar letter by "Juvenus."

⁹ *Ibid.*, April 22, 1873.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, April 29, 1873. See issue of May 3 for an approving reply to Mr. Chucks by "Truth," a Negro.

Many *Times* readers agreed with Chucks. "Audax" wrote that the 70,000 Negroes in the state were entitled to a representation in the government commensurate with their numbers and denounced the white supremacy Democrats as an incubus weighing down Louisiana as the Old Man of the Sea did Sinbad.¹¹ "Radical Democrat" condemned the leaders of the Democratic party as "political highwaymen."¹² Many writers begged Roundabout to keep the professional party bosses out of the proposed new party, to bar the "noisy demagogues" of the Democratic party who had aroused the whites against the blacks as surely as the carpetbaggers had aroused the Negroes against the whites.¹³ The chorus of approval for racial co-operation even penetrated into the columns of the *Picayune*, the organ of extreme Democrats.¹⁴ A prominent conservative white man was quoted as saying: "We are completely in the hands of a set of men whose interest it is to keep alive this ill-feeling. They live on it. . . . We must get rid of party hacks and political jobbers, and satisfy the reasonable demands of the negroes."¹⁵ The jubilant Roundabout exclaimed that a new era had arrived in which "the mass of men are fast receding from old landmarks of intolerance and prejudice; when they are casting about them for better guidance than that beneath whose auspices they have been well nigh stranded."¹⁶

The *Times* attempted to strengthen the movement for the talked about unification party by running interviews with business men who, according to Roundabout, were supporting it as the only agency that could restore peace to Louisiana.¹⁷ A prominent merchant declared that

¹¹ *Ibid.*, May 1, 1873.

¹² *Ibid.*, May 4, 1873.

¹³ *Ibid.*, May 16, 1873 (letter by "Progress"); *ibid.*, May 29 (letters by "Progress" and "Last-Ditcher").

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, June 7, 1873 (a young social leader quoted in "Round About Town"); *ibid.*, June 13 (letter by "Sigma"); New Orleans *Picayune*, June 6 (letter by "S").

¹⁵ New Orleans *Times*, May 29, 1873.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, May 18, 1873; *ibid.*, May 23 ("Round About Town"); *ibid.*, June 2, editorial: "We are at the dawn of a new dispensation. Politically, old things are passing away and all things are becoming new."

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, June 2, 1873.

he favored giving the Negroes the bulk of the state offices: "I am not afraid that they will in any considerable degree, abuse their privileges, and, for ourselves, we want nothing but peaceful government."¹⁸ A business man, described as one of "our oldest and best," said: "Approve of it! It is our only hope of salvation. . . . We want a party that will embrace a broad and comprehensive view of things, that will say to the negro: Here, we want your political influence to restore an honest government. . . . You want civil equality; you shall have it, if you forsake the Northern adventurer who has plundered poor Louisiana until she is penniless."¹⁹ A plaintive real estate dealer cried: "On with unification for God's sake, if it will give us an honest government; our present lot is insupportable."²⁰

As the rumors of the formation of the new party ran through the city, other newspapers voiced their approval of unification. The *Herald*, an extreme Democratic journal, calling upon the whites to "commit to an eternal oblivion the stubborn and ancient prejudices which are now at war with the fundamental ideas of our democratic system," endorsed the proposed movement.²¹ The influential French-language paper *L'Abeille*, announced its support of the principle of unification, but withheld complete approval until it could see the specific plan which the co-operation party was expected to present.²² Most important of all for the success of the unification movement was the indorsement of the *Picayune*, the leading organ of the conservative Democrats. This paper came around slowly to a support of unification, and at first its approval was grudging.²³ But it finally proclaimed complete ratification: "Let there be a union, then, on terms of the broadest liberality. Let there be an end of prejudice and proscription, and for the future let there be no differences of opinion dividing our people except upon questions of

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, May 30, 1873.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, June 6, 1873.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, June 23, 1873.

²¹ New Orleans *Herald*, quoted in New Orleans *Republican*, May 31, 1873.

²² *L'Abeille de la Nouvelle Orleans*, quoted in *Opelousas Courier*, June 7, 1873.

²³ New Orleans *Picayune*, June 6, 1873.

governmental polity.”²⁴ The only sour notes in the New Orleans press came from Republican papers. The state-subsidized *Republican*, obviously confused as to the motives of the sponsors of unification, warned Negroes and Republicans that unification was a sinister, disguised Democratic plot to sabotage the Kellogg government; said it was absurd and should be ignored; said it was dangerous and should be defeated; and invited the unifiers, if sincere, to join the Republican party.²⁵ Another Republican organ said that the Negro leaders supporting co-operation were the educated former “free colored men” who had no mass following among the race and who could not deliver the Negro vote.²⁶

This question of how “representative” the Negro supporters of unification were and what they might demand of the new party bothered whites who were disposed to accept co-operation.²⁷ To resolve these uncertainties, the *Times* interviewed Dr. Louis C. Roudanez, Paris-educated, wealthy, cultured Negro leader. Shrewdly, Roudanez denied that his race wanted social equality. All they asked was civil equality and honest government. “Let your people come out fairly and squarely and guarantee us [our rights], and a party can be formed that will sweep the State like wildfire,” he stated. “A carpet-bagger, white or black, will become a thing of the past, and the vocation of agitators in either party will be forever gone.”²⁸ Colonel James Lewis, Negro member of the city council, told the *Times*: “If the gentlemen who propose this movement are in earnest; if it is given without any mental reservations, and there is really to be a total abandonment of the prejudices which have so long kept us in the humiliating position we now occupy, we’re with you heart and hand.”²⁹ A delegation of the most

²⁴ *Ibid.*, June 8, 1873.

²⁵ New Orleans *Republican*, May 28, June 1, 3, 4, 7, 1873.

²⁶ New Orleans *Deutsche Zeitung*, May 30, quoted in *ibid.*, June 1, 3, 1873.

²⁷ New Orleans *Times*, June 3, 1873.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, May 28, 1873. The interview is with an anonymous Negro leader, but the description of him identifies him as Dr. Roudanez.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, June 1, 1873. Again the interview is with an anonymous leader and again the description affords an identification.

prominent Negroes in the city called at the *Times* office to pledge the support of their people to unification.³⁰ State Senator James H. Ingraham assured the whites: "We have no disposition to Africanize this State. . . . [W]e are still willing to trust you; to confide our destiny to your keeping; to place the administration of affairs under your control."³¹ Without exception all these Negroes said that they had allied politically with carpetbaggers only because the native whites had spurned association with them.

While the press discussed the issues of unification, the actual sponsors of it, white and colored, were holding a series of secret meetings. Their identity was for the moment unknown, but the whites were pronounced to be "Southern gentlemen" and the Negroes the "wealthiest and most intelligent colored men."³² Finally it became known that a Committee of One Hundred, fifty from each race, was at work.³³ Then it was announced that the Committee would meet on June 16 to hear a report from a sub-committee appointed to draw up a platform upon which the races could unite. The meeting and the platform were crucial, said the *Times*, and would determine the future of Louisiana.³⁴

The meeting of June 16 revealed to an intensely interested public the backers of the unification scheme. Isaac N. Marks was in the chair, and General P. G. T. Beauregard, Louisiana's great Civil War hero, headed the committee on resolutions. The white sponsors were the business, legal, and journalistic leaders of the city.³⁵ The Negro sponsors were

³⁰ *Ibid.*, June 3, 1873. See also *ibid.*, June 2, for letters from Negroes supporting unification.

³¹ *New Orleans Republican*, June 1, 1873.

³² *New Orleans Times*, May 26, 30, 1873.

³³ *New Orleans Republican*, June 13, 1873. The *Republican*, at this point, began to swing over to support unification.

³⁴ *New Orleans Times*, June 16, 1873.

³⁵ Obviously fifty men cannot be identified in an article of this space. The author is thoroughly familiar with the names of the New Orleans leaders of the period. Most of them appear on the list of the Committee. The presidents of practically every corporation and bank in the city were members. It should be noted that most of the leading business men of New Orleans were not natives of Louisiana. They had come to the city from the North or from other southern states to seek their fortunes as young men. Those from

the wealthy, cultured aristocracy of the race; many of them were the so-called "Creole Negroes" who had been free before the war.³⁶ The roster of the important resolutions committee read like a Who's Who of white and colored New Orleans. Of the white members, Beauregard, not satisfied to bask in his war glory, was president of the New Orleans and Carrollton Railroad. James I. Day was president of the Sun Mutual Insurance Company, a former president of the Bank of Louisiana and of the New York, Providence and Boston Railroad, a commissioner of the Fair Grounds Association, and a member of the board of directors of the Louisiana Equitable Life Insurance Company.³⁷ Marks was president of the Firemen's Charitable Association, which represented all the fire companies in the city, the Louisiana Fair Association, the New Orleans, Florida, and Havana Steamship Company, and the Mutual Aid and Benevolent Life Insurance Association; chairman of the board of commissioners of the fire department; a director of the Sun Mutual Insurance Company; and the owner of a grocery company.³⁸ Auguste Bohn was president of the Mechanics' and Traders' Bank, a director of the Louisiana Mutual Insurance Company and of the New Orleans Cotton Exchange, and a stockholder in the Vallette Dry Dock Company.³⁹ Judge William M. Randolph, a native of Virginia and a

outside the state who were leaders in the 1870's had lived in Louisiana during the decades before the Civil War and had thoroughly identified themselves with the life of the state. See *New Orleans Republican*, June 5, 1873.

³⁶ R. L. Desdunes, *Nos Hommes et Notre Histoire* (Montreal, 1911), 181-82.

³⁷ There is a sketch of Day in Edwin L. Jewell (ed.), *Jewell's Crescent City Illustrated* (New Orleans, 1873), 129. Some of the above information about his business connections was obtained from business notices in the *New Orleans Picayune*, April 15, May 3, September 5, 1873. Day was a native of Connecticut who had come to New Orleans in 1832.

³⁸ *Jewell's Crescent City Illustrated*, 122; *Edwards' Annual Directory to the . . . City of New Orleans for 1873* (New Orleans, 1873), 291; *New Orleans Times*, March 5, 1874, p. 2; Thomas O'Connor (ed.), *History of the Fire Department of New Orleans* (New Orleans, 1895), 532-36; business notices in *New Orleans Picayune*, March 4, 6, 1866, April 8, 15, 1873, and *New Orleans Times*, August 13, 1873. Marks was born in Charleston, South Carolina, of Jewish parentage, and came to New Orleans about 1836. Before 1860 he was a prominent Whig.

³⁹ Business notices in *New Orleans Picayune*, April 14, May 25, 1873; *New Orleans Republican*, July 18, August 17, 1873; *New Orleans Times*, January 30, 1874.

scion of the great Virginia family of that name, was a leading member of the Louisiana bar and one of the state's popular orators.⁴⁰

Lieutenant Governor Caesar C. Antoine headed the list of Negro members. His inclusion was a grave tactical error on the part of the unifiers. He commanded a following among his race, but his name was anathema to the whites. He was a member of the "custom house" faction of the Republican party, despised by the whites as the most corrupt segment of a corrupt organization.⁴¹ Aristide Mary, Creole Negro and wealthy philanthropist, was almost universally respected by both races.⁴² State Senator George Y. Kelso had some standing as a Republican legislative leader but was known mainly and dubiously to the whites as a follower of the recent governor, Henry Clay Warmoth.⁴³ By far the most distinguished of the colored members was Dr. Louis C. Roudanez. Educated in Paris, wealthy and refined, he was a sincere leader of his race. To advance their welfare, he had founded the New Orleans *Tribune*, the first Negro daily newspaper in the United States. He was convinced that the carpetbaggers were using the Negroes as tools to build up their own power and had no real interest in the colored race.⁴⁴ Last on the Negro list was Charles H. Thompson, well-known preacher and member of the New Orleans school board.⁴⁵

⁴⁰ Jewell's *Crescent City Illustrated*, 100; *Proceedings of the Louisiana Bar Association, 1898-1899* (New Orleans, 1899), 93.

⁴¹ See the sketch of Antoine in *Journal of Negro History* (Washington, 1916-), VIII (1923), 85-87; Charles B. Roussève, *The Negro in Louisiana: Aspects of His History and His Literature* (New Orleans, 1937), 105, 129.

⁴² Roussève, *Negro in Louisiana*, 129, 156; A. E. Perkins, *Who's Who in Colored Louisiana* (Baton Rouge, 1930), 58.

⁴³ Perkins, *Who's Who in Colored Louisiana*, 49; Warmoth, *War, Politics, and Reconstruction*, 147; Charles Nordhoff, *The Cotton States in the Spring and Summer of 1875* (New York, 1876), 61.

⁴⁴ Roussève, *Negro in Louisiana*, 51, 118-20; Perkins, *Who's Who in Colored Louisiana*, 57-58; Warmoth, *War, Politics, and Reconstruction*, 51-54; W. E. Burghardt Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction* (New York, 1938), 456-58.

⁴⁵ New Orleans *Republican*, February 23, April 13, 1873. There were two other Charles H. Thompsons in New Orleans. One was collector of customs and the other a teacher at the Negro school, Straight University. *Edwards' Annual Directory*, 430. The newspaper evidence seems to make it clear that the one on the resolutions committee was the preacher.

The resolutions committee submitted a majority and minority report. After a brief debate, the meeting unanimously adopted the majority report and appointed a committee to arrange a mass meeting of the citizenry of New Orleans to give the stamp of popular approval to its decision.⁴⁶ The approved report was a significant document in the history of Reconstruction and race relations. It represented the efforts of conservative business men to meet and solve one of the grave problems of the postwar South: Who would determine the place of the Negro in southern society—Southerners or outsiders? Certainly no group of Southerners in the Reconstruction era was willing to go farther in harmonizing race relations than the authors of this document, which appeared in the New Orleans newspapers under the title, "An Appeal for the Unification of the People of Louisiana."⁴⁷ The complete statement read as follows:

Whereas, Louisiana is now threatened with death in every vital organ of her normal, material and political being;

And whereas, her dire extremity is but the fruit of unnatural division among her natural guardians—the children of her soil and of her adoption,

And whereas, we have an abiding faith that there is love enough for Louisiana among her sons to unite [them] in a manful and unselfish struggle for her redemption:

⁴⁶ New Orleans *Times*, New Orleans *Picayune*, New Orleans *L'Abeille*, June 17, 1873.

⁴⁷ So far as can be discovered, this is the first time that this document has been published in complete form in any secondary study. Governor Warmoth published approximately the first half of it in his *War, Politics, and Reconstruction*, 240-41, but he erroneously called it the Reform party platform of 1872. Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction*, 481, reprinted this partial version from Warmoth. The document appears in full in *House Reports*, 43 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 261, Part 3, "Louisiana Affairs," pp. 1037-38. The original manuscript, complete with the signatures of the members of the resolutions committee, is in the Department of Archives, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge. The document was published in the *Times* and the *Picayune* of June 17, 1873, and in succeeding issues for almost a month. The version reproduced here is the one that appeared in the newspapers. This is done because the manuscript document is in rough form, lacking such things as proper punctuation, and because it is believed that the document should be presented as it was given to the public. All differences between the two versions have been indicated, however, by including in brackets all material from the manuscript that did not appear in the newspapers. It is to be noted that the differences are few and involve for the most part questions of diction.

Be it therefore resolved—

FIRST—That henceforward we dedicate ourselves to the unification of our people.

SECOND—That by "our people," we mean all men, of whatever race, color or religion, who are citizens of Louisiana, and who are willing to work for her prosperity.

THIRD—That we shall advocate, by speech, and pen, and deed, the equal and impartial exercise by every citizen of Louisiana of every civil and political right guaranteed [by the constitution and laws of Louisiana],⁴⁸ by the constitution and laws of the United States, and by the laws of honor, brotherhood and fair dealing.

FOURTH—That we shall maintain and advocate the right of every citizen of Louisiana, and of every citizen of the United States, to frequent at will all places of public resort, and to travel at will on all vehicles of public conveyance, upon terms of perfect equality with any and every other citizen; and we pledge ourselves, so far as our influence, counsel and example may go, to make this right a live and practical right, and that there may be no misunderstanding of our views on this point:

1. We shall recommend to the proprietors of all places of licensed public resort in the State of Louisiana, the opening of said places to the patronage of both races inhabiting our State.

2. And we shall further recommend that all railroads, steamboats, steamships, and other public conveyances pursue the same policy.

3. We shall further recommend that our banks, insurance offices, and other public corporations recognize and concede to our colored fellow-citizens, where they are stockholders in such institutions, the right of being represented in the direction thereof.

4. We shall further recommend that hereafter no distinction shall exist among citizens of Louisiana in any of our public schools or State institutions of education, or in any other public institutions supported by the State, city or parishes.

5. We shall also recommend that the proprietors of all foundries, factories, and other industrial establishments, in employing mechanics or workmen, make no distinction between the two races.

6. We shall encourage, by every means in our power, our colored citizens in the rural districts to become the proprietors of the soil, thus enhancing the value of lands and adding to the productiveness of the State, while it will create a political conservatism which is the offspring of proprietorship: and we furthermore recommend to all landed proprietors in our State the policy of considering

⁴⁸ It is probable that this clause was omitted from the report because of the repugnance of the whites for the Republican-made constitution and many Republican laws.

the question of breaking up the same into small farms, in order that the [our] colored citizens and white emigrants may become practical farmers and cultivators of the soil.

FIFTH—That we pledge our honor and good faith to exercise our moral influence, both through personal advice and personal example, to bring about the rapid removal of all prejudices heretofore existing against the colored citizens of Louisiana, in order that they may hereafter enjoy all the rights belonging to citizens of the United States.

Be it further resolved, That we earnestly appeal to the press of this State to join and cooperate with us in erecting this monument to unity, concord and justice, and like ourselves forever to bury beneath it all party prejudices [all past prejudices on the subject of race or color].⁴⁹

Resolved, also, That we deprecate and thoroughly condemn all acts of violence, from whatever source, and appeal to our people of both races to abide by the law in all their differences as the surest way to preserve to all the blessings of life, liberty and property.

Resolved, That we pledge ourselves to the cultivation of a broad sentiment of nationality, which shall embrace the whole country, and uphold the flag [glory] of the Union.

Resolved, That as an earnest of our holy purpose, we hereby offer upon the altar of the common good, all party ties, and all prejudices of education which may tend to hinder the political unity of our people.

Resolved, That in view of numerical equality between the white and colored elements of our population, we shall advocate an equal distribution of the offices of trust and emolument in our State, demanding, as the only conditions of our suffrage, honesty, diligence and ability; and we advocate this not because of the offices themselves, but simply as another earnest and proof upon our part, that the union we desire is an equal union and not an illusive conjunction brought about for the sole benefit of one or the other of the parties to the [that] union.

The motives animating the whites who helped to draw up this report invite analysis. It can be speculated that some of them did not wholly approve of the sentiments but saw in the proposed movement Louisiana's only hope of securing economic stability and honest government. Others, doubtless, believed that the state was faced with the prospect of permanent Negro suffrage, supported by the national government, and resolved to put the best face on the matter and try to control the Negro vote. Two of the white signers explained their support of uni-

⁴⁹ This stronger statement was doubtless deleted out of deference to the sensibilities of the press.

fication. Beauregard had long believed that the whites could lead the Negroes to vote the right way.⁵⁰ Now he issued a public statement detailing his views. He argued that the Negro already had political and civil equality, guaranteed by the national and state constitutions, and that the whites might as well accept the fact. Continued Negro cooperation with the carpetbaggers would ruin the state. Therefore the whites must persuade the Negroes to leave the Republicans. The recipe was simple—let the whites recognize the Negroes' rights. Once this was done, the Negro would desert the alien carpetbagger and join his natural friend, the southern white man.⁵¹ If Beauregard's reasons were predominantly pragmatic, Marks' were completely philosophical. He was opposed to any form of racial discrimination. "It is my determination," he proclaimed, "to continue to battle against these abstract, absurd and stupid prejudices, and to bring to bear the whole force of my character . . . to break them down. They must disappear; *they will disappear*."⁵²

At the meeting of June 16 the sponsors of unification laid their plan before the people for discussion. The reactions came fast, and in New Orleans they were generally favorable. The *Times*, as befitted the unifiers' first journalistic champion, was approving and optimistic of success.⁵³ The *Picayune* voiced unqualified support of the unification platform: "It is a Louisiana proposition, for Louisiana alone—to save the People of Louisiana from being garrotted by the thieves and tyrants who now hold us by the throat. We heartily support the great end sought to be obtained."⁵⁴ The *Republican*, which had at first denounced unification, was now a vigorous supporter, although it could not resist

⁵⁰ John R. Ficklen, *History of Reconstruction in Louisiana through 1868* (Baltimore 1910), 185, quotes Beauregard's views on Negro suffrage in 1867.

⁵¹ New Orleans *Picayune*, July 1, 1873; New Orleans *L'Abeille*, July 1; New Orleans *Republican*, July 2. For comments on Beauregard's statement, see New Orleans *Times*, July 1, pp. 1, 2. See also a letter from Beauregard to Jubal A. Early, quoted in *Times*, August 8, p. 3.

⁵² New Orleans *Times*, July 23, 1873, p. 2. See also *ibid.*, July 25, p. 3.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, June 18, 1873, editorial and "Round About Town"; June 27 (letter by "C. B.").

⁵⁴ New Orleans *Picayune*, June 25, 1873. See also issues of June 18 and July 9.

taunting the whites for having adopted Republican principles.⁵⁵ Influential individuals came forward to endorse the new movement. The Catholic archbishop of New Orleans, Napoleon Joseph Perche, asked Catholics to give it their support.⁵⁶ Ex-Governors Paul O. Hebert and Alexandre Mouton announced their approval in letters to the press.⁵⁷ The French-language journal, *L'Abeille*, ratified the general principles of unification, but raised a question which was troubling many whites. Were not the whites making all the concessions? Where was the Negro promise to vote out carpetbag government?⁵⁸ The unifiers replied that the Negro leaders were pledged to deliver the colored vote to them.⁵⁹

Unification seemed to have won New Orleans, but it was soon evident that it was not taking among the whites in the country parishes and that it took less and less the farther north it traveled from the city. It was noted that most of the Democratic country newspapers denounced the movement.⁶⁰ "Unification on the basis of perfect equality of whites and blacks!" exclaimed one angry editor. "We abhor it in every fibre of our being. We know no necessity that can bring us to such a pass."⁶¹ Said the leading white supremacy organ of North Louisiana: "The battle between the races for supremacy . . . must be fought out here . . . boldly and squarely; the issue cannot be satisfactorily adjusted by a repulsive commingling of antagonistic races, and the

⁵⁵ New Orleans *Republican*, June 16, 19, July 12, 1873. The issue of June 20, however, carried letters by readers questioning the sincerity of the whites and the success of the movement.

⁵⁶ Archbishop Perche, writing in *Le Propagateur Catholique*, official journal of the Diocese of New Orleans, quoted in *Picayune*, June 22, 1873. Unification was denounced, however, by another Catholic journal of the city, *The Morning Star and Catholic Messenger*, which said that Beauregard was violating his principles as a southern gentleman and a Catholic by accepting unification. See *Morning Star*, quoted in New Orleans *Republican*, July 1.

⁵⁷ Hebert, quoted in New Orleans *Times*, July 11, 1873; Mouton, in *ibid.*, July 12.

⁵⁸ *L'Abeille*, June 18, 1873. See also *Picayune*, June 18, p. 2, where prominent supporters of unification raised the same question.

⁵⁹ New Orleans *Times*, June 19, 21, 1873; *Picayune*, July 12, 1873.

⁶⁰ New Orleans *Republican*, July 1, 3, 1873; Alexandria *Rapides Gazette*, July 26, 1873.

⁶¹ Monroe *Ouachita Telegraph*, June 21, 1873.

promulgation of platforms enunciating as the political tenets of the people of Louisiana the vilest Socialist doctrines."⁶² Another editor stated: "They have not seen, as we in the country have, that the colored man will never vote with the white man, but always against him."⁶³ There was, however, some white support in the country, from individuals and newspapers, for unification.⁶⁴ One Democratic editor asked: "Is there anything in it? Will we be any better off? Shall we resign our last remaining privilege? Gentlemen, that privilege is hollow to the core, and the experiment . . . is worth a trial."⁶⁵ The Republican country papers divided in their opinions on unification. Some gave it enthusiastic support, others advised the Negroes to have nothing to do with it or invited the unifiers to join the Republican party.⁶⁶

While the state debated unification, the Committee of One Hundred went ahead with its plans to hold a great mass meeting in New Orleans to ratify publicly the co-operation platform. This meeting, it was believed, would decide the fate of the unification movement.⁶⁷

At Exposition Hall, on July 15, the unifiers held their make or break public meeting. The hall was jammed. Over the platform hung a banner with the inscription: "Equal Rights—One Flag—One Country—

⁶² Shreveport *Times*, quoted in *ibid.*, July 19, 1873.

⁶³ Clinton *Patriot-Democrat*, June 28, 1873, quoted in St. Francisville *Dunn Leader*, July 12. Strong white opposition to unification in Plaquemines Parish was noted in *L'Abeille*, July 16, and in Catahoula Parish in Monroe *Ouachita Telegraph*, July 19.

⁶⁴ New Orleans *Times*, June 24, 1873 (letter from a citizen of Plaquemines); *ibid.* July 13 (dispatch from Franklin); *Picayune*, June 26 (letter from a citizen of Marksville).

⁶⁵ Brashear *News*, quoted in Donaldsonville *Chief*, June 28, and *Picayune*, June 26, 1873. See also Opelousas *Courier*, June 21, and Convent *Le Louisianais*, July 12.

⁶⁶ For Republican approval, see Opelousas *Journal*, June 21, 1873; Alexandria *Rapides Gazette*, July 19, 26; Baton Rouge *Grand Era* (Negro), quoted in New Orleans *Republican*, June 24; Franklin *Attakapas Register*, quoted in Opelousas *Courier*, June 21. For Republican disapproval, see St. Francisville *Dunn Leader*, July 19; Natchitoches *Times*, quoted in New Orleans *Picayune*, July 13; West Baton Rouge *Sugar Planter*, quoted in New Orleans *Republican*, July 29; Lake Providence *Lake Republican*, August 2.

⁶⁷ New Orleans *Times*, July 11, 1873; New Orleans *Picayune*, July 11, 13, 15; New Orleans *Republican*, July 11. These issues carry the unification platform, with the signatures of approximately one thousand approving citizens.

One People." Marks took the chair and made the opening address. "We came here to-night, I hope and trust in God," he said, "to lay upon the altar of our country all the prejudices of the past, to recognize all citizens of the United States as equals before the law. . . . [W]e have got to determine among ourselves that we will reunite the population of Louisiana, and that we will work together as one people for the redemption of the State." The next speaker was a Negro, State Senator T. T. Allain, born a slave, widely respected by whites. He criticized those whites whose prejudices had prevented racial co-operation in the past, praised the unification platform but called for a practical application of its principles, and ended, "I maintain that all my race demands is pure and simple justice, and I call upon you, Louisianians, to give it."⁶⁸ Then James Davidson Hill, one of the owners of the *Picayune*, appeared and made a brief plea for racial harmony. The choice of the following speaker was a prime political blunder. He was State Senator J. Henri Burch, a Negro. He was long-winded, he was a carpetbag Negro from Connecticut, he was a member of the corrupt customs house faction of the Republican party, and he was thoroughly disliked by the whites.⁶⁹ He made a bad speech. He said, in effect, with a patronizing manner: We Negroes congratulate you whites upon overcoming your silly prejudices; we will help and guide you upward on the path that leads to complete tolerance; and if you are sincere, we will co-operate with you politically. His speech went a long way toward ruining the meeting, and the next speaker completed the work. This was James Lewis, administrator of improvements in the city council

⁶⁸ For a sketch of Allain, see Alice Dunbar-Nelson, "People of Color in Louisiana," in *Journal of Negro History*, II (1917), 75. See also Perkins, *Who's Who in Colored Louisiana*, 49, 52.

⁶⁹ For sketches of Burch, see A. E. Perkins, "James Henri Burch and Oscar James Dunn in Louisiana," in *Journal of Negro History*, XXII (1937), 321-25; Perkins, *Who's Who in Colored Louisiana*, 49-50; *Harrisburg National Progress*, quoted in *New Orleans Republican*, April 13, 1873; *New Haven Palladium*, quoted in *ibid.*, September 10, 1873. See also Warmoth, *War, Politics, and Reconstruction*, 191, 193. For white opinion of Burch, see *New Orleans Times*, May 28, 29, 1873; *Clinton Patriot-Democrat*, quoted in *St. Francisville Dunn Leader*, July 12.

and one of the colored leaders of New Orleans.⁷⁰ He read a pledge, signed by eight Negroes,⁷¹ designed to answer the criticism that the whites were making all the concessions to achieve unification and the Negroes none. Nothing could have reflected more strikingly the deep distrust which the colored people felt for the whites than this curious and politically inept document. It stated that when the Negroes received full recognition of their civil and political rights, then, but not until then, would they unite with the whites to overthrow the carpet-baggers and give Louisiana honest and economical government. This conditional promise rang down the curtain on the meeting like a wet blanket.⁷²

Not even the *Times* could pretend that this had been a successful meeting. Dourly it commented that the unification movement was "fairly afloat," but that rough seas lay ahead.⁷³ Other papers, more realistic, labeled the meeting and movement as a flat failure. The *Republican*, noting that most of the crowd had been Negroes and that Beauregard and Randolph had not been present, decided that the white unifiers were not ready to carry out their part of the contract. It concluded that neither the white nor the colored leaders could really bind their people to support unification.⁷⁴ The *Picayune* charged that Negroes had killed unification by their refusal to co-operate with the whites until their rights were recognized: "They are unwilling to meet the white man on common ground, with common laws and common privileges, and struggle with him to achieve the redemption

⁷⁰ On Lewis, see Perkins, *Who's Who in Colored Louisiana*, 56, 58; New Orleans *Picayune*, May 13, 1873; New Orleans *Republican*, February 20.

⁷¹ The signers were Lewis, Mary, Roudanez, Antoine, who have been identified; and Paul Bonseigneur, a Negro labor leader; William Moody, a preacher; William Rodolph, a Republican ward leader; and a D. or C. Rillieux, who cannot be identified. His initial is given differently in the newspapers. There were several prominent Negroes of this name but none with either of the above initials. The original manuscript of the Negro pledge is in the Department of Archives, Louisiana State University.

⁷² This summary of the meeting is drawn from the *Times*, *Picayune*, *Republican*, and *L'Abeille* of July 16, 1873.

⁷³ New Orleans *Times*, July 17, 1873.

⁷⁴ New Orleans *Republican*, July 17, 19, 1873.

of all from ruin, and thus overcome the prejudices which divide and ruin; but they demand that the white man shall come with bated breath and stoop that they may step beyond.”⁷⁵ In similar vein, the *Herald* accused Lewis, with his pledge, of being the murderer of unification: “He was the ruthless bird who killed Cock Robin, with the arrow furnished him by the customhouse managers. That pledge inflicted the fatal stab at the very heart of the Unification, and it fell at the foot of Pompey’s statue.”⁷⁶ The Shreveport *Times* congratulated New Orleans for having “repudiated this vile thing. In this she has been true to the State; in her capacity she has not fallen.”⁷⁷ By the end of August the press had written off unification as a thing of the past.⁷⁸ The best obituary of unification was pronounced fittingly enough by Roundabout:

It’s a subject he isn’t sweet on just now—chiefly, however, because he thinks it has been villainously murdered. The traditional impracticability of this community stepped in and finished it. . . . The trouble was that Gen. Beauregard & Co., being thoughtful gentlemen, appealed to a sense of kindness and justice and magnanimity that was slightly inaccessible. They saw that it was right, but forgot that the most available argument would have been that of expedience. . . . It has been misjudged; its spirit distorted; its deductions falsely and illogically stated.⁷⁹

The failure of the unification movement demands analysis. The primary reason, of course, was that its platform was not acceptable to the whites. They would not support the concessions made to the Negro because they were afraid that these concessions would lead to racial

⁷⁵ New Orleans *Picayune*, July 18, 1873.

⁷⁶ New Orleans *Herald*, quoted in Monroe *Ouachita Telegraph*, July 26, 1873, in Opelousas *Courier*, July 26, and in Alexandria *Rapides Gazette*, July 26. The Opelousas *Courier*, July 26, a Democratic paper which had approved unification, said that unfortunately some “wolves in sheep’s clothing” had been allowed to slip in among the Negro supporters of the movement.

⁷⁷ Shreveport *Times*, August 20, 1873.

⁷⁸ Thibodaux *Sentinel*, August 2, 1873; Alexandria *Rapides Gazette*, August 2, 9; Opelousas *Courier*, September 6. There seems to have been no formal abandonment of the movement by its sponsors. It disappeared in silence.

⁷⁹ New Orleans *Times*, July 22, 1873.

equality.⁸⁰ The surprising thing is that there was so much white acceptance of a position of equality for the Negro; this suggests that in some respects the traditional picture of Reconstruction needs to be revised so far as white attitudes are concerned. One other reason for failure suggests itself. Unification was a reform movement run by amateurs. Its leaders made the mistakes that amateurs often make. The unifiers boasted that they had barred professional politicians from their organization.⁸¹ Yet the hand of a professional would have saved the movement from some of its blunders. Any good ward heeler, for example, would never have let Burch speak at the meeting of July 15. The worst effect of excluding the politicians was to cause those of both parties to fight unification.⁸² "And that's what the matter," said one sage editor. "The Democratic politicians and the Republican politicians will oppose any movement that will break up their political organizations, and thrust them into retirement."⁸³

A recent study of Reconstruction politics in Mississippi questions the validity of the usual classification of the leaders in two extreme groups—on the one hand the Republicans, composed of the carpetbaggers, a few renegade scalawags, and the Negroes, striving to maintain their corrupt hold on government, and on the other the Democrats, the native whites, fighting to restore white supremacy—and, noting that many former Whigs became Republicans, suggests that the role of the scalawag in Reconstruction has not been adequately portrayed.⁸⁴ The Louisiana unification movement projects on the Reconstruction scene

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, June 30, July 1, 3, 7, 1873; *Picayune*, July 18 (letter by "B").

⁸¹ *New Orleans Times*, June 2, 1873 (letter by "Tendis"); *ibid.*, July 13 ("Round About Town").

⁸² For the attitude of the Democratic politicians, see Roundabout in *Times*, July 22, 1873. For the Republican politicians, see Governor Kellogg, quoted in *Republican*, November 4; Pinckney B. S. Pinchback, *ibid.*, September 19; and James R. West, *ibid.*, June 28.

⁸³ *Alexandria Rapides Gazette*, July 26, 1873. See also *Brashear News*, quoted in *Picayune*, July 26.

⁸⁴ David H. Donald, "The Scalawag in Mississippi Reconstruction," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), X (1944), 447-60.

still another group whose importance has not been recognized—the business men, not closely affiliated with politics, who saw the strife of parties and races destroying the stability they desired and who tried to harmonize political and racial extremes to restore peace and profits.⁸⁵

⁸⁵ It is not known whether "unification" movements appeared in all the southern states. There were co-operation organizations formed in South Carolina and Mississippi. See Francis B. Simkins and Robert H. Woody, *South Carolina during Reconstruction* (Chapel Hill, 1932), 447-54; Alrutheus A. Taylor, *The Negro in South Carolina during the Reconstruction* (Washington, 1924), 195-97; John S. Reynolds, *Reconstruction in South Carolina, 1865-1877* (Columbia, 1905), 139-43; James W. Garner, *Reconstruction in Mississippi* (New York, 1901), 238-43. The South Carolina and Mississippi movements seem to have been narrower in the scope of their platform than the one in Louisiana, being restricted largely to political issues. Both, it is significant to note, were led by planters and business men.

Plantation Architecture of the Lower South on the Eve of the Civil War

BY JAMES C. BONNER

Southern plantation architecture, in the popular mind, carries the connotation of a massive structure, adorned with a portico of stately columns of classic design, and flanked with giant magnolia trees, crepe myrtle, and mimosa.¹ A misconception of the realities of plantation life frequently arises from a tendency to associate these traditional forms with the mode of living which they suggest. The houses in which people have lived in other periods of their history were intimately a part of the whole structure of their lives; they reflect the social and cultural aspects of the period. An understanding of those buildings will contribute to an understanding of the life which took place around them.

Frederick Law Olmsted observed in 1853 that there was "hardly a poor woman's cow on [Cape Cod] . . . not better housed and more carefully provided for than a majority of the white people of Georgia."² Similar observations by travelers have been applied with equal fidelity to every state in the cotton belt, and they have been confirmed by numerous ante-bellum Southerners. About this time, for example, the editor of the *Soil of the South* stated, with some exaggeration perhaps, that "not one planter in a hundred has a house which can be dignified

¹ This paper was read at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Historical Association, at Nashville, Tennessee, on November 3, 1944. It has been expanded and documented. The discussion deals principally with the planter's homestead and it is limited to the developments in the cotton belt during the three decades before the Civil War.

² Frederick Law Olmsted, *Journey in the Seaboard Slave States* (New York, 1856), 538.

with the name of a barn." He continued: "We do not know of any one thing in which our agricultural reputation suffers so much . . . from the dwelling house down to the wagon shelter, all of our improvements are ordinarily of a temporary nature."³ An Alabaman, after a trip through the South, stated that the countryside appeared to him as if a shower of rails had fallen on one day and a shower of houses on the next.⁴ A Georgian, in 1845, compared the two sections of the United States in words almost identical with those used by Olmsted nearly a decade later. In the North, he said, "[one] sees an appearance of comfort; men of very modest means live in neat houses . . . there seems to be a place for everything and everything in its place. [In the South] . . . people seem to regard their places of abode as necessary evils [and treat them] as an Arab does his tent. . . . As to ornamenting the grounds around it [*sic*] with trees and shrubbery, such an idea does not seem to have occurred to the occupant."⁵

It is not to be supposed that only planters of limited means lived in dilapidated houses. A great house of classic design in a rural setting was a rare phenomenon, even among the more prosperous planters. Travelers who visited the South were frequently astounded at the great number of wealthy men they found living in miserable dwellings. Emily Burke described her visit to a large plantation in Georgia where she saw the yards, woods, and pastures teeming with cattle, horses, mules, goats, hogs, and chickens. The master's residence "had not a pane of glass in the windows, nor a door between the apartments." Neither was there "a shadow of a board" between the floor and the coarse shingles of the roof. Yet within this crude habitation was a table loaded with an endless variety of delicate food, and "beds of the softest down." A Northerner, she observed, "would suppose that many men of great wealth in the South were poor men because their dwellings were so

³ *Soil of the South* (Columbus, 1851-1857), IV (1854), 103; V (1855), 135.

⁴ *Southern Cultivator* (Augusta-Athens-Atlanta, 1843-1935), III (1845), 100.

⁵ *Ibid.*, III (1845), 75, 101. Concerning the appearance of homesteads, a South Carolinian stated: "Of all things we are most deficient in taste about such matters in the South. Nobody knows how long he will live where he is, and now California has made fools of so many, it will be worse." *Ibid.*, VII (1849), 41.

miserable.”⁶ Such observations were by no means confined to northern schoolteachers. A southern editor, in 1857, noted “the singular want of elegance and comfort about the domestic arrangements of those who are able to provide them.” He wrote: “A log house half decayed with age, or a frame house without paint, and . . . a yard without a shrub or a flower . . . are too frequently the insignia of a planter’s premises.”⁷ Charles Alfred Peabody of Alabama, the horticultural editor of the *Soil of the South* and later of the *American Cotton Planter*, was perhaps the most enthusiastic writer in the Lower South on architecture and landscape gardening. He early launched a campaign to improve the standards of southern rural houses, but his comments are often replete with frustration and discouragement. In 1853 he wrote:

A house, with a garden of 60 feet by 40 in its rear, full of long collards (fit only for cows and then when steamed) the oaks cut down in front, a Spanish mulberry or China tree planted in their stead, under the shade of which is seen in the summer time a lazy pack of egg-sucking hounds, or noisy sheep-killing curs, half starved, is a sight that too often meets the eye . . . to make the task of educating such a people either pleasant or profitable employment.⁸

Today, one can travel through the heart of the Alabama black belt, from Tuskegee to Montgomery, and thence to Greensboro, and see a striking succession of old one-story houses, simply designed, containing four to six rooms. This is a section noted for the lasting fertility of its soil.⁹ Martin W. Philips, one of the best known planters of Mississippi, called his residence “Log Hall,” and the appellation was most appropriate. Surviving homesteads of famous Southerners are likely to present to later generations an appearance of neatness and elegance which they did not possess in the day of their owner’s glory. A contemporary of Alexander H. Stephens, for example, described Liberty Hall as an old-fashioned wooden house in a grove of original forest trees. There were

⁶ Emily P. Burke, *Reminiscences of Georgia* (Oberlin, 1850), 23-24.

⁷ *Soil of the South*, extra (1851), 15.

⁸ *Ibid.*, III (1853), 10.

⁹ For a description of this area, given by an observer in 1847, see Andrew J. Pickett, “The Red Lands of Alabama,” in *Southern Cultivator*, V (1847), 10.

no lawns about the place to draw the admiration of visitors, and the immediate setting was one of untrimmed grasses and weeds.¹⁰

The planter's barns, fences, and outhouses were worthy matches for the residence. The southern farmstead has been described critically and in detail by the agricultural reformers of the cotton belt. Concerning plantation barns, one of these stated: "The common arrangement is a rail pen for corn, a rail pen for shucks, [with] fodder and oats in stacks." He insisted that there was enough shattered corn and rotten fodder about an average-sized southern plantation to maintain a respectable northern establishment.¹¹ A Middle Georgian stated that more than half the farmers in his county never housed their oats and fodder at all, and that not one-tenth of them had any shelter for their cows.¹² A southern editor, after a trip through the Georgia Piedmont, in 1852, reported that he saw only half a dozen "respectable barns."¹³

The smokehouse was described as one of the greatest needs of the average plantation.¹⁴ One planter wrote: "A filthy smokehouse is a disgusting subject to write about, but as they are so numerous, I hope to be pardoned. It is enough to restrain the most inordinate appetite [to] be shown into the smokehouse and regaled with the scent from its ground floor, spread with fragments of meat and bones and [the walls] decorated with fat cans and soap gourds. My word for it, smoking ham and dainty steak would have no attractions for them."¹⁵

Negro quarters were generally criticized as inadequate. It was

¹⁰ Autobiography of Raphael J. Moses, an unpublished manuscript in the Southern Historical Collection (University of North Carolina Library), 141.

¹¹ *Soil of the South*, IV (1854), 103.

¹² *Southern Cultivator*, VII (1849), 52.

¹³ *Ibid.*, X (1852), 252.

¹⁴ Emily Burke wrote that the inhabitants of Upper Georgia were "one hundred years behind the times" in progress and improvement. "Cellars which we consider so indispensable [in New England] are never dug, to my knowledge. . . . Consequently, we never see good butter there in the warm season. . . . Meat is not salted and barrelled as here, but smoked and dried, and generally tainted during the process. I never saw any meat preserved in this way that I could eat; and it was more than I wished to do to sit at the table where it was." Burke, *Reminiscences of Georgia*, 23-24.

¹⁵ *Soil of the South*, I (1851), 13.

claimed that too many families occupied the same house. The cabins were built too near the ground and this permitted the accumulation of filth underneath. Glass windows were absent, faulty chimneys caused smoke to fill the room, and the houses were in too close proximity to other houses. Toilets were poorly located with respect to drainage, and improperly constructed.¹⁶

One plausible explanation of the conditions which prevailed on the cotton planter's homestead was given by John Forsyth in an address before an Alabama horticultural society in 1851. He said that it was a common experience to find that dilapidation of southern homesteads was the result of "that unsettled feeling that lurks in almost every bosom." His audience had never known a farmer in Alabama or Georgia, he continued:

. . . who would not sell out and move for his price on the land. . . . The evil consequences strike the eye of every traveller on our public roads. Go to the homestead of a Southern farmer and tell me what you see. Do you find a substantial and comfortable dwelling, arranged with taste and care, and sparkling in clean white paint? Do you find [its porches festooned] with jasmine and woodbine? Are its flowers and garden surrounded by neat palings and . . . beds of flowers? Do you find order, thrift, and economy in his barnyard? Spacious and well constructed barns . . . firm and substantial fences? Alas! No. The planter's home is generally a rude ungainly structure, made of logs, rough hewn from the forest; rail fences and rickety gates guard its enclosures. . . . And why? Because the settlement is not regarded as a home, but only a temporary abiding place. . . . This system is a blight on our land. . . . Our home is anywhere between the two oceans. . . . We murder our soil with wasteful culture because there is plenty of fresh land West—and we live in tents and huts when we might live in rural palaces.

But Forsyth would not recommend to Southerners that they follow the architectural style of northern houses. His discourse throughout carried a distinct note of southern nationalism. He concluded by say-

¹⁶ For a description of these conditions and suggestions for their improvement, see *American Cotton Planter and Soil of the South* (Montgomery, 1857-1860), III (1859), 67-68; *Soil of the South*, II (1852), 229; *Southern Cultivator*, VIII (1850), 162; XIV (1856), 170; XVIII (1860), 276-77.

ing: "Let us have a civilization of our own and depend on our Yankee neighbors neither for refinement and elegance, nor Weathersfield onions and Connecticut cheese."¹⁷

The prevalence of emigration was by no means the only factor cited as causing disorganization of the homestead in the Lower South. It was held that the one-crop system was speculative and perverse; it supplied no incentive to repair a leaking roof or to fix up a fence. A South Carolinian complained that planters grew cotton right up to the door, kept no servants in the house, and grew no wheat and insufficient corn. He described a friend who worked about thirty slaves as "a gentleman of education and refinement, with a nice and accomplished wife," but he noted that the guest room in which he spent the night was half-filled with cotton and without a fireplace.¹⁸ Many Southerners longed for a stable, non-cotton economy; they contrasted the drabness of a cotton plantation to the neat, pastoral habiliments of an economy based upon livestock, grain, or fruit.¹⁹

Thus the criticism given by travelers of the domestic aspects of southern life was amply substantiated by natives. These Southerners were passionately interested in improving homesteads as a preventive for emigration, exploitation of the soil, and the one-crop system with its economic and spiritual liabilities. "We abandon without regret, the ill-shaped, crazy, and comfortless cabin, around which the bare earth burns under the fiery sun, or rank weeds pollute the air with poisonous

¹⁷ *Soil of the South*, I (1851), 124-25.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, I (1851), 54.

¹⁹ "Traveling through the country of Virginia," said a Georgia editor, "we see a different state of things. There we see venerable old mansions, comfortable farm houses, and the evidences of wealth all around. . . . We must fix population before we can educate, improve, and refine." *Ibid.*, I (1851), 15. Jarvis Van Buren wrote in 1858: "Although our head is slightly seared by frosts of time, yet we trust to see the 'sunny south' scattered over with tasteful cottages and the surroundings of thrifty orchards and glowing flower gardens, these being the external harbingers of high civilization, intellectuality and progress. . . . When these adornments become a part of our homes, the desire for roving and seeking new ones to be again worn out and abandoned will cease, our people become truly pastoral, more happy, contented, and independent." *South Countryman* (Marietta, Georgia, 1859), I (1859), 18.

odors," wrote a southern editor. "But it is a different thing to contemplate the abandonment of a comfortable home."²⁰

It was out of this welter of dilapidated homesteads, emigration, and ravages of the one-crop system that Southerners began to formulate a philosophy of rural architecture. In their discussions of this topic it is possible to recognize the emergence of a "Southern system" of plantation architecture, involving the arrangement of the landscape as well as the design of the buildings. It is significant to note that this development occurred in the 1850's, when the quest for economic independence was undergoing transition to southern nationalism and political independence.

This attempt by Southerners to discover a native architecture for the section reveals two significant facts. The first is that only rarely did either the editors of agricultural journals or the planters whose comments upon domestic buildings have been preserved advocate anything remotely resembling the Greek Parthenon for the South's architecture. Not a single suggestion of a classic design appears to have been offered by the better known of the southern journals between 1830 and 1860. Southerners were looking for an indigenous style, less ornate and more practical than the Greek Revival.

The second fact is that planters showed extreme reluctance to accept the Gothic Revival, which had already supplanted in popularity the Greek Revival in the North. During the 1850's, however, the Gothic form did have more support in the South than did the Greek Revival. Designs of rural Gothic cottages were widely circulated throughout the section during this decade, their most popular advocate being Andrew J. Downing of New York. His books on rural architecture and landscape gardening were frequently quoted by southern agricultural editors. Downing's plan included small houses, usually without porch or hallway. The side elevations emphasized a steep roof, gables, brackets, vertical boards and batons, arched windows, and diamond-

²⁰ *Southern Field and Fireside* (Augusta, 1859-1864), I (1859), 247.

shaped window panes.²¹ Numerous engravings of Gothic and modified Gothic houses appeared in southern agricultural journals during the two or three decades before the Civil War, but an examination of surviving plantation homesteads fails to reveal any great influence which these plans might have had upon rural builders.²² A reader of the *Southern Cultivator* named them "Newspaper Cottages," and criticized them because they were "like all designs . . . ever seen of Yankee farm houses."²³

Southerners who were inclined to express themselves on the subject of architecture felt that both the Greek Revival and the Gothic were completely out of harmony with the southern landscape, unsuited to plantation life, and not wholly adapted to the climate. Charles A. Peabody expressed the prevailing sentiment when he said: "[Give us] not . . . a gew gaw palace or a ginger bread cottage, but a substantial, comfortable home" adapted to the means of the occupant and the climate of the section. "Give it that graceful colonnade and airy porch for our hot summers, and yet the close and comfortable room for the chilling, changing seasons." Peabody held no brief for what he called "gentlemen's country residences and town mansions," but he emphasized the importance of developing an architecture for what he termed "the bone and sinew of the State."²⁴

²¹ See Andrew J. Downing, *A Treatise on the Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening* (New York, 1855), 375; Andrew J. Downing, *Cottage Residences; or a Series of Designs for Rural Cottages and Cottage-Villas, and Their Gardens and Grounds* (New York, 1842), 32, *et passim*.

²² Daniel Lee wrote in 1848: "Thirty years ago steep roofs were pulled off and flat roofs put in their places. Now flat roofs are unpopular and are giving place to steep ones." *Southern Cultivator*, VI (1848), 141. This statement perhaps characterized with some degree of accuracy the trend in the North, whence Lee had just come to take over the editorial chair of the *Southern Cultivator*. This periodical frequently carried engravings showing elevations and floor plans of rural Gothic houses. In most instances these had appeared earlier in northern journals, suggesting a wide circulation of much-used plates. They seem to have served little purpose in the southern journals other than to fill up space.

²³ *Southern Cultivator*, VI (1848), 89.

²⁴ *Soil of the South*, II (1852), 253. Caution should be exercised in interpreting the word "mansion," when used by ante-bellum Southerners. In that period the word did not always carry the connotation of elegance which has come to be associated with it. It was used originally to designate the owner's residence, or the main house in a plantation

There was much criticism of professional architects because they devoted all their time and talent to what a South Carolinian called "the more pretentious villa." Their efforts to produce "the more humble dwellings," he complained, "are infrequent, and when attempted . . . are of that quasie [*sic*] description, involving the eccentricities of a feudal hybred of a stunted church." He expressed a dislike also for Greek and Roman forms. "Grecian architecture," he said, ". . . is decidedly unfit for domestic purposes, and only seems to be in proper character, reposing in some quiet back street of a city, there to afford shelter to the pedantic gentleman, who instills classics into reluctant urchins. Greek architecture is too stiff to associate with trees. Its staid pillars, unbroken shadows, its heavy frowning entablature looks uncongenial."²⁵ Another critic called Gothic houses "mis-shapen palaces and . . . poor imitations of European aristocracy." He condemned also the extravagance of erecting "what would appear to be massive columns, but which are generally made of wood, in the ridiculous ambition of appearing to live in something like a Grecian temple." He admitted that columns might be appropriate in public buildings, but added: ". . . nothing is more like an eagle's feather stuck in the matted hair of a savage, than frail, plank pillars, or columns, painted white, so ostentatiously stuck out in front . . . of a dwelling house. A worse taste can hardly be imagined."²⁶

A Floridian who often expressed his views on plantation architecture also denounced both the Greek and Gothic forms. The house should be, he insisted, "not an imitation of some showey village mansion, with porticos and Ionic columns, or of some cocked hat cottage, all gables

or farm group, regardless of its size or appearance. As planters left the land and moved to town, as they were inclined to do during the late ante-bellum period, the term came to be used for the town residence. Since this town house was often of ample proportions and of classic design, the term began to assume its present meaning. An elegant house in a rural setting was often referred to as "pretentious," a term intended for somewhat milder use than "ostentatious."

²⁵ C. Reagles, "The Philosophy of Suburban Cottage Homes," in *Southern Cultivator*, XV (1857), 325.

²⁶ *Southern Cultivator*, XIV (1856), 362.

and no house; but should be moderate in proportion . . . accompanied with no expense for mere ornament."²⁷ A Georgian, condemning what he called "massy [*sic*] Doric columns and Corinthian capitals attached to private residences," thought that a middle ground might be found between the classic extreme and the current type of southern farmhouse. "A three bushel sack of bran called a bustle did not more disfigure a pretty woman, than does lofty fluted columns, erected at vast expense and in violation of all propriety and utility," he said. "This style of building and that of two story houses with sheds to sun beds on, painted white . . . need reformation altogether."²⁸

Dennis Redmond, publisher of the *Southern Cultivator*, was critical of the current fashion of constructing end-chimneys to dwelling houses, a practice which apparently evolved from the single-room log house. Redmond suggested that such chimneys on plantation houses were impractical and designed largely for ornamental purposes.²⁹ Useless embellishments were everywhere generally looked upon with disfavor. Even the appearance of family cemeteries was criticized because of their sculptural figures and extravagant monuments. In place of these was suggested "simple, rural decorations" in harmony with the surrounding countryside.³⁰

The kitchen, or cook room, received considerable emphasis. The unappetizing odors and the flies which often emanated from these servant-run institutions was a subject for some comment. This suggests that danger from fire hazards alone does not fully explain the prevailing practice of separating the kitchen from the big house. One writer said: "[Give us] the homely, comfortable, kitchen of the well to do working man, where the wife and the teakettle sing together."³¹

Post-bellum writers, often with greater flair for romance than for

²⁷ George R. Fairbanks, "Essay on Farmer's Homes," in *Soil of the South*, II (1852), 65.

²⁸ *Soil of the South*, III (1853), 404.

²⁹ *Southern Cultivator*, XX (1862), 20.

³⁰ *Southern Field and Fireside*, II (1860), 55.

³¹ *Southern Cultivator*, XII (1854), 30. For comments on southern cooking, see *ibid.*, XVIII (1860), 295.

history, have represented the Greek Revival as the traditional rural house of the plantation South. It would be difficult, however, to justify this theory in the light of known facts about the cotton plantation. Even in the grain and tobacco belt of the Upper South one sometimes wonders why the traditions of Mount Vernon and Monticello did not exert a greater influence upon plantation builders. But the cotton belt, throughout the whole of the ante-bellum period, was in relatively close proximity to the frontier; there utility rather than display was the dominant principle. Thus the plantation house was much more than a residence. It was the center and core of a large business establishment. While it probably stood in unfavorable comparison with northern residences, it excelled in most respects its economic counterpart—the northern factory.

It cannot be denied that the Greek Revival form did exist in the Lower South. For both town and rural use it enjoyed greater popularity there than it did in the North and West. This type of house was, in many ways, well suited to the climate of the section. Its wide, high porches, set off by white columns, protected the walls from the sun's slanting rays. They made it unnecessary to close the windows during summer rains when humidity was greatest.³² The slatted shutter, or blind, which in reality formed a kind of double wall, was a most practical contrivance. While modern architects have relegated it to the role of mere ornament, it may easily become a necessary feature of the modern, air-conditioned house.³³ The high ceilings of the interior were a notable adjustment to the weather. The low-pitched, unobtrusive roof was not a disadvantage where snows were light and infrequent. The failure of this type of house to gain the popularity which later generations feel that it deserved was not due to its inadaptability to the climate. Its rejection may be understood if it is remembered that in the 1850's the planter sought not only a rural agrarian style, but one which was distinctly southern.

³² Rupert B. Vance, *Human Geography of the South* (Chapel Hill, 1932), 369.

³³ Lewis Mumford, *The South in Architecture* (New York, 1944), 26.

The romantic picture of the plantation master sitting beneath a classic entablature, calling up his slaves by Greek and Roman names, with Plato in one hand and Aristotle in the other, was not a spectacle often encountered in the cotton belt. If the southern colonel with his mint julep had nothing more to do than follow the shade around the portico on hot summer days, he was most likely an absentee landowner, living off unearned increment, or perhaps enjoying a political career. His shaded portico quite likely adorned a town or village mansion, somewhat removed from the realities of plantation life. A few exceptions might be found in almost any community of ample proportions. Notable exceptions are to be found today on the old road from Charleston to Columbia and on the road along the Mississippi, from Natchez to Vicksburg. But even here, if we are to rely upon the impressions of travelers, these stately residences gave an appearance of being entirely out of harmony with the real purposes which they served. A traveler in the Natchez district of Mississippi wrote in the 1830's: "A huge colonnaded structure . . . struck our eyes with an imposing effect. It was the abode of one of the wealthiest planters of the state. . . . The grounds about this edifice were neglected, horses were grazing around the piazzas, over which were strewed saddles, whips, horse blankets, and motley paraphernalia with which planters love to lumber their galleries. On nearly every piazza in Mississippi may be found a wash-stand, bowl, pitcher, towel and waterbucket for general accommodation. . . . Here they wash, lounge, often sleep, and take their meals."⁸⁴

Today, in many old southern towns and villages, these Greek Revival houses may still be found in great number and in some variety, and it is too often forgotten that before 1860 it was there, and not on the plantation, that they achieved their highest perfection in the Lower South.⁸⁵ It is significant to note that the Greek Revival house in the

⁸⁴ Joseph H. Ingraham, *The South-West*, 2 vols. (New York, 1835), II, 97-100, quoted in Ulrich B. Phillips, *Life and Labor in the Old South* (Boston, 1929), 333.

⁸⁵ For a somewhat typical illustration of this point, see Nelle Womack Hines, *A Treasure Album of Milledgeville and Baldwin County, Georgia* (Macon, 1936), 33, *et passim*. This book, the material for which was originally compiled in commemoration of Georgia's bicentennial in 1933, contains fourteen engravings of old houses. Only

1840's and 1850's was associated with such mischief as absenteeism and the tendency of farmers to move off the land and to imitate urban life. A typical complaint is that of a Georgian who stated in 1851 that when a Southerner acquired sufficient means he immediately abandoned the farmstead "and aspired to no higher abode than a city mansion, apeing the disgusting and fashionable."³⁶ At the same time, an agricultural reformer wrote that "If farmers who . . . seek display in their town houses would live on their farms, they would create good schools and organize good society at one tenth the cost of a town residence . . . and their boys [would not be] hanging around taverns and confectionaries."³⁷

The cost of building an elegant house and maintaining it in a good state of repair was likely to be less in town than on the plantation. The diminishing supply of timber in certain regions of the cotton belt and the limitations of transportation facilities are factors worthy of consideration in evaluating plantation buildings. The total timber resources of the Lower South have blinded many to the fact that certain broad areas were practically depleted by 1860. An editorial in the *Milledgeville Recorder* deplored the rapid disappearance of trees and forests in Middle Georgia and cited the scarcity of fencing material as the reason for the desertion of old homesteads and the westward migration.³⁸ In 1855 a worm-rail fence around a thirty-six acre field was estimated to cost as much as the land itself.³⁹ Oak posts for board fences were quoted at Washington, Georgia, at fifty cents each.⁴⁰ This situation, and the

three of these were rural residences. Of these three, the only elegant house was built by a former governor of the state who, after retiring from office, became implicated in the illicit slave traffic.

³⁶ *Soil of the South*, I (1851), 135. In urging laws to compel farmers to stay on their farms, a planter in 1851 pointed out that "the country would be . . . adorned by the fine villas scattered over it." *Ibid.*, 102.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, I (1851), 102.

³⁸ Quoted in *Southern Cultivator*, XII (1854), 92.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, XIII (1855), 155. Garnett Andrews of Wilkes County, Georgia, wrote in 1844 that several hundred acres at a time often sold in Middle Georgia for a dollar or less an acre. "The usual rule is to sell the wood-land for what it may . . . be worth, and give the purchaser the old lands and houses for nothing," he observed. Quoted in Henry S. Randall, *Sheep Husbandry in the South* (Philadelphia, 1848), 60.

⁴⁰ *Southern Cultivator*, VIII (1850), 167.

inadequacies of sawmills and railroads caused finished lumber products to become rare luxuries in many areas.

The scarcity of timber might have led to the use of substitute materials for building, such as brick, slate, stone, and cement, as it did in parts of the Upper South and in sections of the Middle and New England states at an earlier period. But the Old World atmosphere of permanence which these materials suggest was a rare virtue in the architecture of the cotton belt. Products from the lime kilns and slate quarries of the upper piedmont did find their way by rail to certain urban centers;⁴¹ but wood, processed by hand, remained the principal building material for plantation houses. At Augusta, Georgia, Dennis Redmond experimented in the construction of Negro houses made of clay, or tapped earth, and reported some success with this material.⁴² Other suggestions included a plastic roofing made of cotton.⁴³

Observers, both native and foreign, noted particularly the absence of trees, shrubbery, and grasses around southern houses. This deficiency was a notable aspect of the southern landscape in towns and villages as well as in the countryside.⁴⁴ The spirit of the frontier died slowly and hard in the Lower South. Trees were still considered by many as barriers to progress; and grass was the principal bane of the cotton

⁴¹ *South Countryman*, I (1859), 73. Owners of the Van Wert quarry near Rockmart, Georgia, in 1861, offered slate roofing "laid on the roof at any point in Georgia, Alabama, and Tennessee at an expense not exceeding the cost of tin roofing." *Southern Cultivator*, XIX (1861), 150.

⁴² The walls, which were one foot in thickness, rested upon a cement foundation which prevented softening caused from percolation of moisture from the earth. To give protection from rain the roof was extended two feet beyond the walls, and the latter were given a thin coating of cement. *Southern Cultivator*, XV (1857), 184.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, XV (1857), 184, 185. Experiments on such projects as these and with similar materials were resumed more than seventy years later by the Farm Security Administration under the New Deal.

⁴⁴ "It must have struck you as well as it has everybody else . . . how very bare, unromantic, [and] parched up, the generality of our back country villages or country houses appear for want of shade around them," wrote a Southerner in 1848. *Southern Cultivator*, VI (1848), 141. An English traveler described Augusta in the 1830's as "a long straggling town . . . with a main street at least a mile long and full of small stores and low taverns," and he noted the comparative scarcity of trees. He said that all southern towns were very much alike. George W. Featherstonhaugh, *Excursion Through the Slave States*, 2 vols. (London, 1844), II, 328-29.

planter's existence. Both were obstacles to be destroyed, not plants to be cultivated. Grass, particularly, was not likely to find succor anywhere around the planter's premises. In a section where livestock had free range, the maintenance of a flower bed and the care of shrubbery were trying problems.⁴⁵ Also, trees and shrubbery around a dwelling house had long been associated with disease. The *Southern Cultivator*, as late as 1857, for example, reported the case of a man who lost his wife and three children by illness resulting from barren mulberry trees growing thickly in his yard.⁴⁶ Professor William N. White, of the University of Georgia, advised against planting trees near the house for reasons of health.⁴⁷ Charles A. Peabody, one of the most prolific writers on landscape gardening and architecture in the Lower South, laid down the following principle: "Plant no tall trees near the dwelling . . . to build a handsome mansion and cover it up with trees is a false taste."⁴⁸ It would seem that the aesthetic sense of Southerners had been conditioned by their long association of trees and miasma with the "summer sickness."

The condition of southern gardens was described in 1856 by Robert Nelson, a Danish nurseryman. He settled at Macon and later moved to Montgomery, where he succeeded Charles A. Peabody as the horticultural editor of the *American Cotton Planter*. His comment follows:

Every horticulturist who looks into our Southern gardens must at once be struck with the very limited variety he there finds. A few unsightly arbor vitae, Cape jasmines, and Rosemarys will be about all; while, on the other hand, many beautiful Evergreens abound in our woods and swamps, to say nothing of the mountains. None of these, however, (with the exception of the . . .

⁴⁵ Jarvis Van Buren wrote in 1852 of a week of trouble on his farm: "The fowls are on the wheat . . . the hogs are rooting up all they can find worth rooting for; and today seven cows and three hogs got into my wife's flower garden, and went to work pruning rose bushes and other shrubbery in fine style, whilst the hogs were . . . loosening the earth about the hyacinths and tulips." *Southern Cultivator*, X (1852), 207. For an excellent discussion of gardening and horticultural conditions in Georgia in the period under consideration, see Hubert B. Owens, *Georgia's Planting Prelate* (Athens, 1945), 19-51.

⁴⁶ *Southern Cultivator*, XV (1857), 86.

⁴⁷ *Southern Field and Fireside*, II (1860), 230.

⁴⁸ *American Cotton Planter and Soil of the South*, I (1857), 211.

"Mock Orange" and now and then, though rarely, a Magnolia) have been considered worthy of being introduced into our gardens.⁴⁹

Indeed, the magnolia, which has come to be symbolic of the Old South, was something of a domestic innovation in the cotton belt, even in 1860. Despite the natural beauty and hardihood of this tree, there are few plantation homesteads in the cotton belt which knew the fragrance of its flowers before the Civil War. Old photographs make excellent source material. Rarely will one of these fail to substantiate this statement.⁵⁰

But the magnolia is not to be denied its proper place in southern traditions. It is one of the many products of southern nationalism of the 1850's—a nationalism which manifested itself in many and varied forms. One of its variations was that tendency to substitute native flowers and evergreens for those customarily imported from other sections and from abroad. In addition to the magnolia, other natives which came into prominence at this time were the southern laurels, rhododendrons, and azaleas, the holly tree, bay, tulip poplar, oak, cedar, sweet gum, and even the lowly pine.⁵¹ Coincident with the growing popularity of the indigenes there was a tendency to depreciate such exotics as crepe myrtle, cape jasmine, arbor vitae, buckthorn, and mimosa.⁵² It remained for subsequent generations of southern garden enthusiasts to select the best and most virile of all these forms and to produce a remarkable combination of flowering trees, both native and

⁴⁹ *Southern Cultivator*, XIV (1856), 188.

⁵⁰ For example, see Francis Trevelyan Miller (ed.), *The Photographic History of the Civil War*, 10 vols. (New York, 1911), I, 35, 359; II, 157, 169, 171, 195, 201, 202, 205, 287, 290; III, 105, 126, 127, 246; IV, 179; V, 69; VII, 231, 233; VIII, 207; X, 57, 59.

⁵¹ *Soil of the South*, I (1851), 140; *Southern Cultivator*, VI (1848), 141, 154; XIV (1856), 64; XV (1857), 92, 93.

⁵² In 1852 Charles A. Peabody ridiculed a wealthy neighbor who cut down all the trees on his building site and "placed a mammoth mass of timber called a house on the top of the hill to bask in the morning, noonday and evening sunbeams." As the venerable trees began to disappear, "Europe, Asia, and Africa were ransacked for diminutive shrubs to take the place of those forest patriarchs." He concluded his tirade by observing that it was "one of the greatest misfortunes that can befall a man, to possess great wealth without any taste." *Soil of the South*, II (1852), 299.

acclimated. "Plant only such trees as are long lived, and 'tho we may not live to see the perfection of their beauty, our children may," was the true prophecy of Charles A. Peabody in 1857.⁵³ Peabody did as much as any Southerner of his day perhaps in stimulating a native floriculture for the South. Among his ideas was a southern horticultural and botanical garden for indigenous plants, and an annual flower festival at some city in the Lower South where native trees, shrubs, and flowers could be popularized and distributed.⁵⁴

It is necessary to note that some of the aversion to planting trees on lawns in proximity to the dwelling seems to have disappeared by 1860. Even Peabody modified some of his earlier statements on this subject. But the principal use for trees in the southern landscape design was to line the avenue leading up to the house, or to break the monotony of a wide expanse of open space.⁵⁵ The native holly was found useful as a hedge against cattle. Planted in drills, it was said to be a good substitute for buckthorn imported from England, or Osage orange from the North.⁵⁶

One of the most significant features of Peabody's "Southern system" of landscape gardening, as he finally worked it out, was his sharp deviation from the system advocated by northern writers, particularly that of Andrew J. Downing. Downing's system might be summarized as follows: Tall trees should be placed so as to form a background to the main edifice. Trees and shrubs might also flank the house, the taller trees being nearest the building and the lowest-growing shrubs the farthest away. Thus the plantings, together with the house, formed a profile resembling a bell-shaped curve. The front of the house was to be left exposed so as to give it dignity and importance.⁵⁷ Peabody, on

⁵³ *American Cotton Planter and Soil of the South*, I (1857), 211.

⁵⁴ *Soil of the South*, V (1855), 56.

⁵⁵ *American Cotton Planter and Soil of the South*, I (1857), 211, 242; *Southern Field and Fireside*, II (1860), 230.

⁵⁶ *Soil of the South*, I (1851), 12; *De Bow's Review* (New Orleans, 1846-1880), V (1848), 83.

⁵⁷ Downing, *A Treatise on the Theory and Practice of Landscape Gardening*, 57, *et passim*.

the other hand, would have the building harmonize with the distance rather than with its immediate surroundings; the house was to stand relatively isolated. The dwelling and not the street was to be the vantage point from which the landscape picture was to be created. "The bulbs and little annuals [should be planted] close under the windows," Peabody advised; "roses and dwarf shrubbery next, then trees."⁵⁸ Thus Downing's effect of a bell sitting upright became a bell inverted, as it were, with the house in the center. In this manner, ostentatious display of the house—a point so often frowned upon by Southerners—was to be avoided. Peabody believed that the southern, rural landscape should be visible from the house where its beauty could be enjoyed, but the house was to have no emphasis in the landscape picture.⁵⁹ It is significant to note that Peabody was striving to achieve a rural-agrarian expedient for the South in contrast to Downing's system, which was largely English, and which had sprung from an urban-industrial society.

The decade of the 1850's was relatively prosperous for the cotton planter, and the period witnessed the transformation of many substantial log houses into larger clapboard structures, frequently including an ingenious lean-to for the accommodation of a growing family. There persisted many elements of the Greek Revival superimposed upon a

⁵⁸ *American Cotton Planter and Soil of the South*, I (1857), 211-12.

⁵⁹ This idea was also apparent in the writings of other Southerners. George Kidd, for example, agreed with Peabody in general when he suggested that trees and tall shrubbery were necessary "for bringing out the beauties and proportion of a fine mansion, and subduing the rawness of a new dwelling." He cautioned against a formal arrangement which would "fritter away the effect of the whole, concentrating the interest in the neighborhood of the mansion, to the exclusion of those natural runs, really and truly very beautiful, and most beautiful because natural. I would rather simply dot over the lawn with trees singly or in groups." *Ibid.*, I (1857), 242. Professor William N. White, of the University of Georgia, advocated a scheme which emphasized a front lawn from which the dwelling would seem to spring. His total effect would be achieved by having trees flank the sides of the building and joined by a mass of trees in the background, all at a distance of not less than thirty feet from the house. This would give "a charming effect to the picture, while at the same time the necessary offices of the house, such as kitchen, servants' rooms, etc. [would be] fully concealed and all unseemly contrast with the main structure avoided." *Southern Field and Fireside*, II (1860), 230.

framework of logs, or hewn timbers, to betray the transformation to future generations. The combining of pieces of plain molding to form triglyphs reflected a studied attempt to retain a pleasing effect and at the same time to avoid extravagant display of an entablature. A more striking example of conservative blending appears in connection with the development of the great hall in the center of the house as perhaps the most consistent feature of the plantation residence of the late ante-bellum period. In frontier days this had been merely the breezeway between the rooms of a double log cabin, but in the course of the transformation the entrance to this hall quite often came to be flanked by two wooden columns supporting a pediment; or, in some localities, as in parts of the North Carolina Piedmont, the columns were entirely absent and a floating pediment was suspended at the roof-line, well above the roof of a simple, one-story porch.

It is evident that a compromise between the Greek Revival and the Gothic on one hand, and the double log house with its many variations on the other, was well under way by 1860. Definite progress was made toward harmonizing the conflicting elements in each. The movement emphasized low cost, simplicity, and comfort. The use of indigenous materials was popularized, and was particularly noticeable in landscaping. This incipient plantation architecture not only reflected southern nationalism, climate, and the agrarian culture of the region, but it also reflected that political democracy which came to characterize the South between 1830 and 1860. But the development of what promised to become a genuine plantation architecture in the Lower South was interrupted by the Civil War and the movement never came to full fruition. After the war, the architecture of the cotton belt was chaotic, and in this respect it was perhaps only a little less suggestive of frustration than was the South's social, economic, and political life.

Notes and Documents

THE ADVENT OF WILLIAM GREGG AND THE GRANITEVILLE COMPANY

EDITED BY THOMAS P. MARTIN

Among the new cotton mills which rose in the South during the decade of the 1840's was that of the Graniteville Manufacturing Company, William Gregg, President, incorporated in December, 1845, by an act of the legislature of South Carolina.¹ This mill, built of granite, was avowedly and deliberately planned for the establishment of cotton manufacturing by white free labor instead of Negro slave labor in that state. William Gregg, a merchant in jewelry, silverware, and fine goods in Charleston but not a novice in the business of cotton manufacturing, was the conceiver and moving spirit of the Graniteville enterprise and apparently the first to demonstrate effectually that the South could limit chattel slavery to the plantation system and employ its white labor in the building of a complementary industrial system. His purpose, its development, and the progress which he made, as well as the reactions to it, seem worthy of study. Its implications were nationwide.

Descending from Pennsylvania and Delaware Quakers, William Gregg was born in 1800 at Brownsville, on the Monongahela River in

¹ The writer is indebted to Samuel H. Swint, President of the Graniteville Company, Graniteville, South Carolina, for returning his attention to William Gregg. The Company had planned a centennial celebration, had established the Gregg Foundation which would include historical work, and he was seeking additional manuscript materials. He has since secured the services of Dr. David Duncan Wallace as Director of the Foundation, to whom the writer is also indebted for criticisms and suggestions.

For the broader setting of these notes and documents, see Thomas P. Martin, "Conflicting Cotton Interests at Home and Abroad, 1848-1857," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), VII (1941), 173-94.

Pennsylvania. He was brought up by an uncle, a watchmaker of Alexandria, Virginia, who in President Madison's time turned to cotton manufacturing in Georgia; and after the failure of that venture he was trained in watchmaking and silversmithing in Lexington, Kentucky, and Petersburg, Virginia. Rising from craftsman to merchant, Gregg moved to Columbia, South Carolina, about 1824, and within ten years made a modest fortune.²

The historian can hardly suppose that William Gregg ever lost the boyhood interest in cotton manufacturing which he seems to have acquired with his uncle in Georgia, or that he failed to notice the small cotton mills within the range of his movements, particularly those at Society Hill, Saluda, near Columbia, and Vaucluse, in Edgefield District, where in 1829 he had married. He may have been aware, also, of the curiously violent and variant planter attitudes toward local manufacturing during and immediately after the nullification movement. When he retired in delicate health in the middle 1830's, he went to the pleasant hills of Edgefield, where George McDuffie and his associates had established in 1833 the Vaucluse cotton and woolen mill on Horse Creek. In 1836 he acquired a considerable interest in the Vaucluse Manufacturing Company, discovered the rise of a dangerous deficit, and took over temporarily the management of the mill. Within eight months he made a profit of \$11,000, which wiped out the deficit and left a balance of \$5,000.³

The effect of Gregg's intervention in the Vaucluse Company seems to have been such as to cause McDuffie to resign as president. But

² Broadus Mitchell, *William Gregg, Factory Master of the Old South* (Chapel Hill, 1928), 1-8. See also the letter from Elizabeth Sheets to William Gregg, July 5, 1857, printed below. Advertisements of Gregg's mercantile house, appearing in the *Columbia* (S. C.) *Telescope*, January 1 and September 17, 1830, November 29, 1831, and November 7, 1834, showed a large business, the stock for which Gregg himself purchased in "the North," where he probably first went to visit relatives near Wilmington and Philadelphia, and later in England and France. He "imported" a watchmaker who, with the aid of two workmen already employed, did watch and clock repairing and jewelry mending. Spoons were made to order.

³ William Gregg, *Essays on Domestic Industry: or, An Inquiry into the Expediency of Establishing Cotton Manufactures in South-Carolina* (Charleston, 1845), shows early first-hand knowledge of cotton manufacturing and of the cotton cloth trade.

McDuffie in turn made such demands for the hire of his seven skilled slaves in the mill as may well have caused Gregg to pause.⁴ So far as is known, Gregg had not had much use for slave labor under such masterly wage control, and he may have considered seriously for the first time the fact, which he certainly knew, that white labor was available at wages that could easily be offered. For the time being, therefore, he withdrew in 1838 to a congenial partnership at Charleston, South Carolina, with certain of the Hayden brothers of Windsor, Connecticut. From that vantage point, he could renew his former extensive business connections, establish new ones, and bide his time for definite engagement in cotton manufacturing.

The business and family relations of the Connecticut Haydens, whom one may say were able and likeable Yankees at King Cotton's court, turned out to be extraordinarily useful to Gregg. Nathaniel Hayden, the senior member of the firm, retired in 1843 to merchant banking in New York City. Hezekiah Sidney Hayden retired in the 1850's to an influential career in northern Connecticut. Jabez Haskell Hayden, a silk manufacturer of Windsor Locks, Connecticut, used the house of his brothers and Gregg in Charleston as an outlet for his products.⁵ His acquaintance with machinery manufacturers in eastern as well as western Massachusetts was intimate; and Gregg was able to help him in a successful mediation between one of them and a customer in South Carolina. Moreover, by the Agreement of July 17, 1842, which was drawn up when Nathaniel Hayden decided to retire, Gregg was able, by furnishing the capital, to leave the management of the business in the capable hands of Hezekiah Sidney Hayden.⁶

At leisure once more, Gregg could now return to the intriguing subject of cotton manufacturing. The opportunity apparently was at hand. McDuffie, traveling abroad in 1838 and visiting the cotton mills of

⁴ George McDuffie to James Bauskett, February 25, 1837, printed below.

⁵ Jabez Haskell Hayden, *Records of the Connecticut Line of the Hayden Family* (Windsor Locks, Conn., 1888), 198, 201-204, 207.

⁶ A copy of the agreement of July 17, 1842, is in the Hayden Family Papers, in the possession of the Misses Dorothy and Ruth Hayden, of Windsor, Connecticut, to whom the writer is indebted for permission to use the collection.

Lancashire, England, had concluded that southern planters could better buy their Negro cloth and other supplies in direct trade with British manufacturers.⁷ Next had come the victory of the protectionist Whig party in the presidential election of 1840 and the enactment of the protective tariff of 1842. This impelled McDuffie to go to the United States Senate, there to combat the protectionists and all their works. In March, 1843, therefore, Gregg and his brother-in-law, James Jones, purchased the cotton and woolen mill at Vacluse.

The energy, resourcefulness, and zeal with which Gregg pushed his cotton manufacturing project suggest that he believed that he had new, constructive ideas. He and Jones promptly renovated the Vacluse mill, disposed of the woolen manufacturing machinery, and manufactured cotton with encouraging success. Next he set about the creation of a new establishment. Proceeding by way of Windsor, Connecticut, where he left a pair of beautiful silver cups inscribed to Nathaniel Hayden,⁸ he visited during the summer of 1844 the various machinery and cotton manufacturing centers of New England, returned to Charleston with an abundance of carefully selected data and notes on his unfolding ideas, and beginning September 20, 1844, published in the *Courier* a series of articles on the expediency of establishing on a higher plane instead of abandoning cotton manufacturing in South Carolina.⁹ He ruthlessly exposed McDuffie's inefficient management at Vacluse and repelled McDuffie's aspersions cast indirectly upon Senator James F. Simmons, a cotton manufacturer of Rhode Island, who as chairman

⁷ McDuffie to James H. Hammond, March 31, 1839, printed below. See also, Edwin L. Green, *George McDuffie* (Columbia, 1936), 174-76, for a quotation from a letter of February 3, 1838, from McDuffie, in which neither the name of the addressee nor the location of the manuscript is given.

⁸ These cups are still in the possession of the Hayden family. In the "Introduction" to his *Essays on Domestic Industry*, Gregg stated that he visited the "mountainous districts" of Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, and New Hampshire, and "saw bags of our cotton arrive in those mountainous districts" from New York, by way of Hartford and up the Connecticut River. From the landing places it was hauled in wagons to the mills.

⁹ These articles were reprinted in booklet form in 1845 as his *Essays on Domestic Industry*.

of the Committee on Manufactures of the United States Senate had had much to do with the shaping of the tariff of 1842.¹⁰

Then Gregg boldly called attention to the white social problem in South Carolina and dramatically demanded: "Shall we stop at the effort to prove the capacity of the blacks for manufacturing? Shall we pass unnoticed the thousands of poor, ignorant, degraded white people among us, who, in this land of plenty, live in comparative nakedness and starvation?" Every political huckster knew the condition, he said. It was "only necessary to build a manufacturing village of shanties, in a healthy location in any part of the State, to have crowds of these poor people around you, seeking employment at half the compensation given to operatives at the North. . . . How easy it would be for the proprietors of such establishments, with only a small share of philanthropy, to make good use of the school fund in ameliorating the condition of this class of our population. . . . Let the ball be set in motion, then will our miserably poor white population at once rise from their ignorance and degradation, and we shall no longer hear the complaint, that planting capital will pay no more than 3 per cent."¹¹

Outside his own state, Gregg's voice in the interest of free white labor was as one crying in the wilderness of excitement over abolitionism, free trade, and the Oregon and Texas questions.¹² But its local appeal was effective. Capitalists of Charleston (the "Boston" of South Carolina), Hamburg, and other cities rallied about Gregg. The none-

¹⁰ The papers of James F. Simmons are in the Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress.

¹¹ Gregg, *Essays on Domestic Industry*, 22, 25. See also, Paul H. Buck, "The Poor Whites of the Ante-Bellum South," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XXXI (1925-1926), 41-54, in which a statement of earlier "experiment" with poor white labor in the South is not justified by sources cited; and John G. Van Deusen, *Economic Bases of Disunion in South Carolina* (New York, 1928), 266-69, for a discussion of the use of slave labor in cotton manufacturing.

¹² A striking similarity of argument may be noted in Abraham Lincoln's "Tariff Discussions [December, 1847?]," in John G. Nicolay and John Hay (eds.), *Works of Abraham Lincoln*, 12 vols. (New York, 1905), I, 309-310 ("a supposed case" in South Carolina). On free trade and the Oregon question, see Thomas P. Martin, "Free Trade and the Oregon Question, 1842-1846," in Norman S. B. Gras (ed.), *Facts and Factors in Economic History: Articles by Former Students of Edwin Francis Gay* (Cambridge, 1932), 470-91.

too-friendly legislature granted a charter. And the philanthropic Ker Boyce of Charleston gave aid in starting the enterprise with a large tract of land and a model village, with churches and a school for the operatives,¹³ all of whom were recruited as planned from native white population.

Yet the fruition of Gregg's Graniteville plan required the continuance of quasi-political efforts, with the risks which those efforts entailed. Boyce desired the support of James H. Hammond, whom Gregg had probably known from early days in Columbia, and with Gregg's approval invited him, though in vain, to be one of the corporators of the Graniteville Company. Hammond had shown in his "Anniversary Oration" of 1841 before the State Agricultural Society that he was friendly to the rise of cotton manufacturing in the South.¹⁴ The banking and railroad interests, with whom McDuffie was allied, were not. Their speculative minds were filled with plans for far-flung railway extensions with state aid, which Hammond, under the pseudonym "Anti-Debt," opposed. While Gregg dogged the steps of Franklin H. Elmore and James Gadsden for some small but none the less important banking and railway facilities for Graniteville, Boyce brought Hammond and Gregg together.¹⁵ Gregg quietly gave Hammond the benefit of all he could learn in the course of his interviews with Elmore and Gadsden,¹⁶ thereby improving a connection which might be beneficial in

¹³ By delay in the matter of enacting a general provision for incorporation, the South Carolina legislature kept in its own hands a potential check or veto to prevent the rise of protectionism within the state. Against this, Gregg protested. See reference, note 30, below. With reference to Ker Boyce's aid, see Mitchell, *William Gregg*, 39-41; and documents printed below, *passim*. In a codicil, dated December 31, 1850, to his will, Boyce provided for several philanthropic bequests, among them "the sum of Ten Thousand dollars to the corporation . . . to found a free school at Graniteville for the instruction of the children . . . in the branches of plain English education." Will Book L (MS.), Charleston, South Carolina, pp. 231-34.

¹⁴ Ker Boyce to Hammond, December 12, 1845, printed below. Hammond's "Anniversary Oration," of November 25, 1841, is in *The Proceedings of the Agricultural Convention of the State Agricultural Society of South Carolina from 1839 to 1845* (Columbia, 1846), 175-91.

¹⁵ Boyce to Hammond, October 29, 1847, printed below.

¹⁶ Gregg to Hammond, November 15, 1847, printed below. See also, Mitchell, *William Gregg*, 132-34, 298-99.

achieving the ultimate goal, manufacturing with free labor. From this goal, Gregg, committed as he was, could never turn back.

Hammond's "Oration" of 1841 had voiced the prevailing cult concerning the use of slave labor in cotton manufacturing, with all its threat of devastating competition with free labor. "Experience has shown," he said, "that our slaves can be made as expert as any other class in all, or nearly all, the operations of a cotton factory. With such abundant water power and such cheap labor, if the effort be made, we can speedily supply our entire home consumption of goods of ordinary qualities, and in due time we may expect to be able to compete with the rest of the world in any other quality, both at home and abroad."¹⁷ And he seemed oblivious to Gregg's white labor proposal of 1844-1845, until Abbott H. Brisbane, influenced perhaps by Fourier through Albert Brisbane and Horace Greeley,¹⁸ turned up with a scheme for production by organized white mechanics.¹⁹ Hammond consulted friends, including Gregg, who adroitly alluded to Hammond's own scheme for draining and cultivating South Carolina's vast swamps with slave labor to compete with agriculture in the West, and observed: "with this I trust we will learn how to associate the labour of the thousands of poor idle people in our own state" in manufacturing, as at Graniteville.²⁰

Thereupon Hammond confided to William Gilmore Simms, "I have a few ideas which I have not yet seen in print and I think I could put some old ones in new points of view."²¹ He returned a kind answer to

¹⁷ Hammond, "Anniversary Oration," *loc. cit.*, 189. The "politics" in this performance is revealed in Hammond's Diary (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress), under date of November 28, 1841: "Delivered the Anniversary Oration of the State Agricultural Society on the 25 inst. Never have been more highly complimented. It was universally said it would prevent any opposition to me for Gov." See also, Elizabeth Merritt, *James Henry Hammond, 1807-1864* (Baltimore, 1923), 59-60.

¹⁸ Charles Sotherland, *Horace Greeley and Other Pioneers of American Socialism* (New York, 1915), 131-36.

¹⁹ Hammond to William Gilmore Simms, December 1, 1848, printed below.

²⁰ Gregg to Hammond, December 1, 1848, and Abbott H. Brisbane to Hammond, December 7, 1848, printed below. Brisbane's activities are discussed in Mitchell, *William Gregg*, 134-38.

²¹ Hammond to Simms, December 22, 1848, printed below.

Brisbane, took Simms with him early in 1849 for a visit to Gregg and to Graniteville, and then ranged far and wide for material to be used in another anniversary oration, this for the new "Society" which Brisbane purposed to form,²² even writing to Hamilton Smith of Louisville, Kentucky, early friend of Salmon P. Chase and advocate of cotton manufacturing by steam power at the coal fields of Cannelton, Perry County, Indiana. Exciting materials were soon available. Smith remarked that for manufacturing "on a large scale we have advantages over you in our cheaper power (coal) & in cheaper subsistence."²³ Christopher G. Memminger, of Charleston, expressed alarm at a scheme for excluding Negroes from mechanical pursuits and filling manufacturing districts with "Lowellers," who would soon be hot abolitionists with votes.²⁴ Solon Robinson, passing through South Carolina, reported that Gregg employed white freemen, because they were "*cheaper* than blacks" and "free to starve if unable to work."²⁵

Spurred by such correspondence, Hammond's speculative thinking soon carried him beyond capability of appreciating and profiting by such cautiously given facts and advice as Gregg provided in his letter of June 20, 1849. Here Gregg, who possibly had not noticed Robinson's shaft, suggested characteristically, "I don't think I would touch the subject of black labour except in a general way," but would show rather that it can "cultivate our swamps inhale the poisonous miasma . . . indure the scorching sun necessary to the growth of cotton & other southern production, then speak of the anglo saxon race now among us & which would be invited to settle in our country by the many natural advantages which we have."²⁶ Supported by Hamilton Smith's

²² Hammond to Simms, January 7, and February 10, 1849, printed below.

²³ Hamilton Smith to Hammond, March 4, 1849, printed below. For accounts of the Cannelton project, see [Hamilton Smith], *Cannelton, Perry County, Ind., at the Intersection of the Eastern Margin of the Illinois Coal Basin by the Ohio River: Its Natural Advantages as a Site for Manufacturing* (Louisville, 1850), and Thomas J. De La Hunt, *Perry County: A History* (Indianapolis, 1916), *passim*.

²⁴ Christopher G. Memminger to Hammond, April 28, 1849, printed below.

²⁵ Herbert A. Kellar (ed.), *Solon Robinson, Pioneer and Agriculturist; Selected Writings*, 2 vols. (Indianapolis, 1936), II, 213-14.

²⁶ Gregg to Hammond, June 20, 1849, printed below. See also, Gregg to Hammond,

later agreeable remark that the only way to bring northern abolitionists to their senses was to "show them, practically, that we can work up the great southern staple at & nearer the fields of its production,"²⁷ Hammond finally drafted and delivered (November 20, 1849) his "oration," which seems to have been only slightly tempered by Gregg's suggestion.²⁸

In the course of this address Hammond said: "That our slaves might, under competent overseers, become efficient and profitable operatives . . . has been fully tested, and would give us, under all circumstances, a reliable source." But he added that if purchased—the only feasible plan of using them—their cost would add fifty per cent to the capital required for manufacturing, and that whenever a slave is made a mechanic, "he is more than half freed, and soon becomes . . . the most corrupt and turbulent of his class. . . . We have, however, abundant labor of another kind, which . . . if not quite so cheap directly, will be found, in the long run, much the cheapest." In one way or another, he explained, they draw their support from the community, or trade with slaves and seduce them to plunder for their benefit. It would be

May 30, 1849, printed below; and Walter Rogers Smith, *A Lecture on the Mechanical Industry and the Inventive Genius of America* (Baltimore, 1849). In his letter of June 20, 1849, Gregg also referred to his "address," which was probably "the first of a series of lectures" before the South Carolina Institute, announced for May 11, 1849. See *Charleston Courier*, May 8, 1849. Gregg was President of the Institute.

²⁷ Smith to Hammond, August 14, 1849, printed below.

²⁸ Hammond to Simms, June 4, 1849, printed in part below. See, especially, Hammond's statement that "Neither Gregg nor Brisbane will tell me what I want to know. They don't understand my wants at all." Writing to Simms again in September, while trying to polish his address, Hammond said: "Gregg and Brisbane plied me with letters some months ago. But as soon as I had sketched off my address, & sent them the heads & asked them how they would do, both dropped me,—not a word since in reply." Hammond to Simms, September 20, 1849, in *Hammond Papers* (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress). Two days earlier he had written to his brother: "I rather think Gregg is vain enough to be jealous of my appointment & would be pleased at my failure. He has certainly not helped me of any consequence. He wants to be flattered, & does not expect it from me. I shall not on such an Occasion sing hosannahs to Graniteville or stoop to trekle [*sic*] any individual or set. My views are altogether broader. I should not be surprised if the whole Fair proves a failure. Every thing moves into cliquism in So Ca, & this is much disposed to do it. Gregg & Co are full of the idea of be coming Cotton Lords.' They are asses." Rough draft of a letter from Hammond to Major [M. C. M. Hammond], September 18, 1849, *ibid.*

better, therefore, to bring them "together in factories, with constant employment and adequate remuneration." There the operative "could not fail to see . . . that the whole fabric of his own fortunes was based on our slave system." With labor both white and black, he continued, the South was superior to the North in ability to "compete with the English in the open and equal markets of the world." For "with our Northern brethren . . . owing to their social and political condition, the tendency of wages is constantly to rise. If they are lowered much, or lowered long, the security of property is at an end. They can substitute no labor for that which is virtually entitled to suffrage, and their government, controlled by those who live by wages, have no power to protect capital against the demands of labor, however unjust. In the South it is wholly different."²⁹

One can only surmise with what mixed feelings Gregg listened to Hammond's "oration," in which Graniteville, designed to be the harbinger of a new South, with its beautiful, well-built white cottages, churches, and school, was held up to northern view as part of the otherwise dismal prospect that southern slavery by holding wages down would stifle infant industrial democracy in its cradle and even drive cotton manufacturing from New England and the North and West into the South. Under the circumstances he was hardly in a position to give expression to his real feelings. He could only as a "practical man" do his best to make Graniteville a success and let the nation judge it, if in the confusion of the 1850's it could, on its own merits. Perhaps we shall yet learn what Gregg thought of Hammond's "oration" and what clear-minded, sober men elsewhere and outside the maelstrom of politics thought about the significance of Gregg's work.

²⁹ James H. Hammond, *An Address Delivered before the South-Carolina Institute, at Its First Annual Fair, November 20, 1849* (Charleston, 1850). This address appears, also, in James D. B. De Bow, *Industrial Resources, etc., of the Southern and Western States*, 3 vols. (New Orleans, 1853), III, 24-37. Mitchell, *William Gregg*, 136, says that Hammond, "probably largely at Gregg's urging, served the industrial gospel with words," but a comparison of this address with the "Anniversary Oration" of 1841 shows that the only important difference in emphasis was on the question of using slaves as industrial laborers. See Merritt, *James Henry Hammond*, 87.

Meanwhile, the Graniteville cotton mill was making itself felt, leaving no doubt of its power and effectiveness as a competitor in its chosen field of coarse goods and yarn. Its fame spread rapidly through South Carolina, the South, and into the North and West. Governor William B. Seabrook of South Carolina, while planning for secession, sought information from Gregg, who supplied it and suggested that a general law on the subject of charters was needed to facilitate the use of associated capital in manufacturing, "which in case of rupture with the General Government will be one of our strong arms of defence."³⁰ Freeman Hunt secured and used two communications by Gregg, in his *Merchants' Magazine*.³¹ Charles H. Mason of Perry County, Indiana, editor of the Cannelton *Economist*, referred to Gregg as "the well known founder of Graniteville," and used Gregg's discussion of cotton manufacturing in New England to convince the world that the West could compete in coarse cloth manufacturing, adding that "it will be cheaper for the cotton planters below us on the river to bring their cotton to our coal, than for us to take our coal to their cotton; and that subsistence [grain and provisions] was of even more importance than coal."³²

But when the suggestions presented in 1849 by Charles T. James, the steam power machinery manufacturer of Rhode Island who had an interest in the Cannelton cotton manufacturing project as well as in James H. Taylor's cotton mill in Charleston, South Carolina, stirred Amos A. Lawrence of Boston to controversy,³³ Lawrence appealed to Gregg for comparative statistics on costs of manufacture. It thus fell to Gregg to demonstrate to the great cotton manufacturers of Massachusetts, as is shown in the correspondence reproduced herewith,³⁴ that free

³⁰ Gregg to William B. Seabrook, May 10, 1850, printed below.

³¹ Gregg to Freeman Hunt, October 22, 1849, in *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine* (New York, 1840-1870), XXI (1849), 671-72, and December 20, 1849, *ibid.*, XXII (1850), 107-108.

³² Typescript copy, in possession of Gregg Foundation, Graniteville, South Carolina, of an article which appeared in Cannelton (Ind.) *Economist*, April 6, 1850.

³³ See Martin, "Conflicting Cotton Interests at Home and Abroad," *loc. cit.*, 180.

³⁴ Amos A. Lawrence to Gregg, August 21, 1850, and Gregg to Lawrence, September 2, 1850, printed below.

labor at Graniteville lived better at lower wages than did the same kind of labor in the North—an infinitely higher ground than that taken by slaveholders, that their Negro slaves lived better.

In fine, if the present writer interprets correctly up to this point, William Gregg, the practically orphaned boy of Delaware and Pennsylvania Quaker descent who grew up in an uncle's small cotton mill in Georgia and was thrown by adversity into that uncle's old trade of watchmaking, worked his way successfully into the larger spheres of silversmith and prosperous merchant, returned temporarily during a period of leisure to cotton manufacturing at Vacluse, South Carolina, and after reflection on current experience with slave labor decided that it would be better to give "remunerative employment" to poor white laborers, whose handicaps he understood and whose plight he pitied. To do this he had to improve local technique, equipment, and management for efficient cotton manufacturing, provide for the well-being and education of white operatives, and, by so doing, encourage white immigration and stop the constant exodus of white labor from the South. He would limit the use of slave labor to plantations and to reclamation of swamp lands, where it was assumed that white men could not work. While admitting and even declaring on occasion that, if necessary, slaves could be trained and used effectively as cotton mill operatives, he showed abundantly in his writings that it was undesirable and not necessary. He would remove barriers, discourage by word and example denunciations and recriminations North and South,³⁵ neutralize prejudices, and let nature take its course along the lines of his own pioneering. For he was confident that as the advantages of the South became evident, capital, talent, and white labor (including that

³⁵ Avery O. Craven, *The Coming of the Civil War* (New York, 1942), 281, observes that William Gregg, "without condemning the North, whose activity and enterprise he warmly admired, . . . sought the well-being of the lesser Southern whites and the wide prosperity of the section of his birth." But the further statement that "Rhett, Yancey, Ruffin, and Gregg were the great leaders who during the stirring fifties were preparing the South for her attempt at independence" seems to be a strange stylistic association of names, at least so far as Gregg is concerned. He was more the practical man of business than of politics.

from the North) would flow there and strengthen the "native." By creating symbolic Graniteville, which with "all modern conveniences" still stands brightly within the larger circle of the Graniteville Company, he proved the soundness of his contentions.

[ELIZABETH SHEETS TO WILLIAM GREGG]³⁶

Toolesboro Louisa Co. Iowa
July 5 1857

Dear Brother

We received your letter and was much pleased to hear from you We are all well at present. I was pleased to hear that you made a visit back to our old home It gives me much information about our connections and acquaintances I very well recollect every person that you named and was very much pleased to hear from them

I think I remember mothers looks Just as well as if I had seen her a month ago I remember her death and how we felt her loss

I expect that I am the only one in the family that remembers anything about our mother now.

I was too young to know what church she belonged I know that she was a good mother & have often heard her old neighbors speak about her being such a good woman If the old church in Morgantown stands where it did I think I could find the very spot where she was buried.

The house we lived in at mother's death is just such a house as you described and stood on the bank of the Monongahela River not far from the saw mill.

Their was a thicket of laurel bushes at the left side of the side of the house, but it may not be there now I saw more trouble about you and May than any other persons After mothers death Jane kept house a while and she left home. I kept house 2 years before father broke up. You and may was all that concerned me I was always watching you for fear something would happen [to] you I dont know as you are certain where your birthplace is it is in Browns-

³⁶ From an enlargement print of a Library of Congress microfilm negative made from the original autograph letter in possession of the Graniteville Company. This letter is included here because of the new information which it furnishes concerning Gregg's family and early life.

[In printing this group of letters, the style of the manuscript has been followed as closely as possible in matters of spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and sentence structure. Two important exceptions which should be noted, however, are the omission of words or phrases crossed out by the writers and the bringing down into the line of all insertions which were indicated by the use of carets. THE EDITOR.]

ville Pennsylvania Mays in virginia in the old settlement where we lived Ruths in Morgantown Virginia and my own is Columbia S. Carolina I was brought from there when I was six years old I saw a man who was acquainted with father when he lived in south Carolina. Jane had 2 daughters you mentioned her sons said nothing about her daughters I would like to know whether they are living or not.

I received a letter from Mary Randall not long since she talked of Mason fetching her on a visit to us

We are anxious to see you and shall look for you next spring You speak of us meeting you at Iowa city but I would much rather you would come down to see us for I think you would like to see where we live. Mr Berryhill has 2 carriages and says you can have them to come any time Give my love to Marina & children, tell them I want to see them very much

No more at present but remain your affectionate sister

ELIZABETH SHEETS

P. S. Write often cannot hear from you too often Tell Marina to write to me.

[GEORGE McDUFFIE TO JOHN BAUSKETT]⁸⁷

Augusta, 25th Feby 1837

Dr Sir

I have announced to the Stockholders, my resignation as Prest of the Vacluse manufacturing Company, & *recommended* them to meet on the 20th of March to create a government, for there is now none. I can not attend but appoint you my proxy, with authority to vote on all questions for me. I have but one instruction to give, & that relates to the price to be allowed for my hands. Mr. Shortridge says one of my girls saves the Factory a dollar a day, another is worth 4 dollars a week, another 3½ dollars, & two others one of them a boy, are good hands that he cannot dispense with without great injury. I have agreed to let my hands remain, if they will allow 700 \$ per annum for those five, & three hundred dollars for the Carpenter Jesse & his wife. I can get a dollar a day for the Carpenter Jesse[?]. If these prices are not allowed I will take them away the 1st of April, & I wish the stock holders to decide this point. I hope you will meet them, & I wish you to write to me immediately afterwards that I may send for my negroes, if they do not agree to give my rate of wages. Clark & McIntyre will sell our goods, & their store will be advertised

⁸⁷ In Historical Society of Pennsylvania Library. Permission to publish is hereby gratefully acknowledged.

as our Ware House in Augusta; Have the advertisement copied from the Chronicle into the Edgefield paper. Nimmo's will be corrected in the next paper.

Yours in haste

GEO. McDUFFIE

[GEORGE McDUFFIE TO JAMES H. HAMMOND]³⁸

Manchester, England 31st March, 1839

My dear Sir,

. . . There being a recess of Parliament for two weeks, I have availed myself of it to visit & examine the manufacturing towns, to ascertain the prices of staple articles required for plantation use, and to see if I cannot lay the foundation of a *direct trade* between the planters in So. Ca. & the manufacturers in Great Britain, with no intermediate charges but a small commission to the Liverpool house that shall be selected to sell our cotton and send our orders to the manufacturers & have them executed. I propose that some twenty or thirty planters should unite in the arrangement, and I have no doubt that by always paying cash we can obtain our supplies 25 per cent cheaper than they now cost us. After '42 when no duty will exceed 20 per cent. negro plains & every plantation supply can be advantageously imported. I shall suggest to the manufacturers the expediency of making negro clothing & some other articles of wool & cotton, which will be much cheaper & fully as good as if made entirely of wool. In the meantime consider the matter, & see how many of your friends would be disposed to unite in the scheme.

[KER BOYCE TO JAMES H. HAMMOND]

Senate Chamber [South Carolina]

December 12, 1845

Dear Sir

You Will see that the Legislature has granted Charter to a few persons to Wit O. Mills W. Gregg, H. Hutchison & Joel Smith Caled the Granittville Manufactory & Company. With a Capital of \$300,000. in this Company, I Expect to put some Twenty or thirty thousand dollars and I have Some time Since had a Conversation With M[r] Gregg and I then stated to him I should

³⁸ Hammond Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress). Except where otherwise noted, the letters which follow are from this collection. The letters by Hammond are drafts or copies.

like you to be a Corporator With us. Which Met his intyre approbation We Wish to take No one in unless he is a practi[c]al Man, and one Who will Require Strict accountability. Now, as to our prospects, I believe it will be a profitable Establishment. Therefore I would like to Know if you Wish to take Stock and how Much you Would like to put in. We intend to have No partners but those that Can pay. I think it proper to Make this Statement as I presume, that you would be like Myself Not to have Any but those that Can pay and Will do so, and you Will See that there is a Section that provides for forcin[g] Any Stock holder, to pay up

I will be glad to hear from you on the receipt of this at Charleston

Yours Most Sincerely [etc.]

KER BOYCE

[KER BOYCE TO JAMES H. HAMMOND]

Augusta, Geo.

October 29, 1847

Dear Sir

. . . Mr William Gregg after I handed him your first 5 Numbers [of Anti Debt] asked Me Who Was Considered the othor [author]. I told him that Col. Carew Was Considered by Many as the othor. after he Wread them over Next Morning told Me that, You Must be the othor and said he had Noticed in your Agricultural Address he noticeed one or two Exspressions, that he had Never seen in any Writings but yours, ("Trust one another,") this he says is a only used by you and some oth[er]s I do Not Now Recolect. Mr. Gregg has Wrote to Col Carew for his paper and to Send the Whole Numbers. He Says No Alarmist is Elmore. I think the last Number on yesterday Morning is Not Elmore but that he has got some One to Write it. I told gregg, if he thinks that you Was the othor, that he ought to give you Some Ideas. he says he would like to do so. But thinks he will go and see you. When I go home I will Let you Know Who is the othor of No Alarmist. I go home to morrow.

Yrs Most Sincerely,

KER BOYCE

[WILLIAM GREGG TO JAMES H. HAMMOND]

Charleston Nov 15th 1847

Dear Sir

I perceive that you are out again with your thirteenth number. You strike with a sledge hammer, each stroke will leave an impression. The article is the street talk of the day.

Elmore has been confined to his house for a few days. I paid him a visit friday on business, shortly after being seated asked him who it was that wrote

against our Rail Roads, he put on a long face and answ[er]ed that it was Hammond, I observed, that there was a capital article in the Mercury that morning No Alarmist, he professed not to have seen it, rung the bell for a servant, asked for the Mercury, it had been loaned out. I soon discovered that I had touched the right Key, made several efforts to get off, but he held on, pulled out a large letter invellope in which he had a large number of newspaper scraps Anti Debt of course among them, which he went over as easily as an expert hand would a pack of cards, he went over the whole ground of No Alarmist, & dwelt so feelingly on their strong points that there was no doubt left on my mind as to who was the author. I next went to the Rail R Office having some business with Gadsden, very soon propounded the same question as to who was the author of Anti Debt & closed by puffing the two pieces in the Mercury, No Alarmist, with which he was perfectly delighted, and spoke of them as containing his sentiments often expressed. Elmore has set him to work to get up a Rail Road tree, a Map I looked at it & praised it as being a most happy conception., he is perfectly delighted with it, and is having it made to be presented to the senate. The Root is in Charleston the body extending to Branchville & two main branches to Hamburg & Columbia these have the bark on, then there are branches, to Camden, to Charlot N. C. to Greenville, from Columbia to Monticello thence across B River to Newberry, from Newberry to Aberville, these are all full grown branches but without matured bark, then again there are sprouts putting out and lines drawn indicating the direction they are to take, one from Charleston to Wilmington, from Charleston to savannah from the Camden Road to Manchester from Camden to Raleigh, from Charleston Direct to Fayetteville, from the Rail Road to Cooshatche also to Blackville from Aiken to Anderson Pickens & Greenville & they say it is intended that a bud shall put forth pointing to Union & Spartanburg Court Houses & possibly to the Iron region. but as these are *minor considerations* they will be permitted rest for the present, or untill the citizens of those regions Come forward to claim their share. This map is in the hands of an Engineer who will make a beautiful thing of it.

Gadsden & Elmore both seem to think that you are prety well used up with the No Alarmists of thursday & friday. I think the article this morning will be food for them. They dislike each other but will draw gently together in the present work, they are both opposed to selling out the state Stock in our Road, Gadsden is a complete tool of Elmore's, & it is obliged to be so, for he well knows that he could not be the president of a company of private Stockholders, he owes Elmore for his bread & Elmore Knows well that if he be thrown onto the same platform (to use his own terms) with the ballance of a parcel of stock holders looking after the interest on their Capital he would not be able to make much of a figure, & certainly loose his present power. I stepped into the Rail Road Bank this morning the subject of anti Debt was soon broached

Jas G Holms said that Hammond was the author, some one asked if it was possible that the statements were true he repeated & with some warmth, Hammond is the author and he speaks from the Book.

My principal object in writing this is to answer one of your questions which I neglected in my last. A great deal of stock was sold for \$16 per when 75 was paid. I sold 100 shares, Isaac Holmes 560 shares were sold for \$15—\$75 paid in. When I sold I regarded the \$25 to be called in to be more than the Stock was worth, indeed I considered it worth less and the \$16 clear gain & based my calculations on the following data

That is, that our capital all paid in on 34,000 shares at \$100 each	
was	3,400,000
From this of course was to be deducted \$25- per share the	
instalments not called in	850,000

leaving the sum of	2,650,000
which was in reality our actual capital	

The mode I used to ballance the account was this

Loss by the purchase of the Hamburg Road.....	1,400,000
do in building the Columbia Branch.....	1,300,000

Loss in winding up the concerns of Rail Road Bank about \$300,000,	
which I put against the sums passed to the credit of the	
company by forfeited shares	2,700,000

This statement you will perceive exhibits a deficiency.....	50,000
more than all which had been paid in.	

I am very sure that the amount of our present debt if Judiciously invested would build the Hamburg & the Columbia Roads & furnish as much cash capital as our Bank is worth.

I am really ashamed to send you a letter so bloted scratch[e]d and altogether illegible, it was written late last night & I really have not time to put it in better shape

yours very respectfy & truly

WM GREGG

[JAMES H. HAMMOND TO WILLIAM GILMORE SIMMS]

Silver Bluff 1 Dec 1848

My Dear Simms.

Gen Brisbane came to see me on strange business. He has taken a notion to "organize the wealth of the South" as he terms it. He wants a "retired

Statesman" to lead the agitation & bring on a Southern Convention. Having failed in Cheves he came to me, deputed as he said by Bennett Lucas, Bill. Kirkwood Gregg & other mechanics whom he has enlisted. His object is simply to give an impulse to manufacturing in the South & he seems wholly unacquainted with what has been done & said on the subject these late years. He regards the scheme as wholly new. The only thing like novelty is that he wishes to have white operatives or to "organize the white basis labour for mechanic purposes"—a capital idea I think. He also proposes a Machine Factory in Charleston. I convinced him that there were no "*retired* Statesmen" in this country—at least under 70 to 75 years of age. That is that no one is *so considered*, whatever he may desire, & that no one who ever had engaged in public life & was yet young enough for it, could "lead" in his project, without incurring for it the opposition of his enemies & rivals. And also I believed that no exclusive leader was necessary. I promised co-operation so far as I could conveniently. Tell me what there is in it when you get to Charleston. Is it some vision of Brisbanes or is there substance in it. I don't wish to meddle any way with bubbles.

[WILLIAM GREGG TO JAMES H. HAMMOND]

Charleston Decr 1st 1848

Dear Sir

Your favour of 28th Ult came to hand yesterday. why dont you know that Gen B[r]isbane once built a rail road one hundred miles long without a dollar to do it with; & but for the fact that the Iron masters took it into their heads that they must have money in hand for their indispensable material, there would have been a rail road in the state of Georgia a hundred miles long without the expenditure of money. The Gen now seems to entertain the impression, that he has conceived a plan by which he will be able to revolutionise public sentiment throughout the southern States and change our industrial pursuits as it were by magic.

I am sorry that I am not able to give you light on the subject. I believe the mechanics of Charleston were called together some time last fall for the purpose of forming themselves into an association—Some twenty men attended the meeting and were addressed by Gen Brisbane. They appointed a committee of which I was one, that Committee had no action untill my return to town when Gen B. called on me in person about dinner time & begged that I would attend the committee that afternoon, four of us met & the Gen read a report &c stated that he had three men in view to head the grand movement in contemplation, that is, Langdon Cheves McDuffie or yourself, he had written to the former and not receiving an answer took advice whether it would not be advisable to visit Savannah for the purpose of conferring with him we advised

against that expenditure of time & money, a few days afterwards I met him at the Rail Road when he told me that he had received an unfavourable answer from Cheves & was then on his way to see you.

I believe his notion is, that it is only necessary for the mechanicks of this state to form themselves into a body & make choice of some distinguished statesman as leader to form a front which would at once invite the formation of similar associations in other Southern states, forming together a body which would be irresistible, politically, upturn all our slothful & anti economical habits & make us as it were by magic a great Manufacturing people.

You are fully aware that all such bubbles must end in wind. that to carry out such a revolution in our customs & habits & the application of labour as you and I are aimin[g] to effect, will be the work of an age & that neither of use need expect to live to see the work carried out.

I am satisfied however that we are on the right track, the result of your labours will be the cultivation of that portion of our State hitherto neglected but which will render her one of the most productive in the Union. the day I trust is not distant when the ditches and dykes which once made a garden spot of our low country will again be brought into use & the thousands of acres of Land now not worth a dollar be found to be superior to those of the far West now selling for 20 to \$30.

And with this I trust we will learn how to associate the labour of the thousands of poor idle people in our state, more in number than would suffice to spin & weave our entire cotton crop, putting into a shape to be consumable by us & exportable at three times the worth of the raw material.

Yours truly

WM GREGG

What do you think of Kershaw in the Mercury

[ABBOTT H. BRISBANE TO JAMES H. HAMMOND]

Charleston 7 Dec 1848

My Dear Sir.

Two days were enough for me with the Representatives of the people. . . . I have returned home Dear Sir, more satisfied than ever with the conviction that *Retired Statesmen* & not the immediate wire pullers of the puppets at Columbia are to work out the problem of national regeneration for our great Southern department of this mighty continent. . . .

I spent a day at Graniteville, and was truly delighted with the operations of the *White basis population*. I am perfectly satisfied that the Spinning jenny belongs as much to the soil of South Carolina as does the hoe & plough.

Let me dear Sir return you my thanks for your letter on Marl. If you devote the same time & *labor* (to use your own word) to our Cause that you have to this, we will soon find Granitevilles in every rural district of the State.

Yr Ob Svt

A. H. BRISBANE

[JAMES H. HAMMOND TO WILLIAM GILMORE SIMMS]

Silver Bluff 22 Dec 1848

Dear Simms

It is certain that Brisbane has no idea of what has taken place since he has been buried in the Georgia piney woods & the citadel Accademy. I have told him & written to him to read the newspapers & reviews. He would soon find that he has not an idea but what has been urged on the people of the South again & again for five years past. He cannot have read Greggs Essays in 1845. He had no idea that the Graniteville Factory was made of granite. If he could get up a machine shop in Charleston he would do good. His notions of Conventions &c are all fudge. I have a few ideas which I have not yet seen in print & I think I could put some old ones in new points of view. I thought of writing Brisbane a letter which he might publish if he chose. I will not do it however until I have *mastered* the subject & that requires besides time, some information which I cannot obtain in a minute. I shall therefore delay writing—perhaps give it out. I certainly shall not deal in crude & vague generalities on such a matter at this time of day.

[JAMES H. HAMMOND TO WILLIAM GILMORE SIMMS]

Silver Bluff 7 Jan. 1849

My dear Simms:

I am rejoicing in the prospect of an early visit from you. . . . Do come prepared to take it easy & no hurry. Graniteville is not so near nor so good a road as to Augusta. I want however to go there, & when I go to meet Gregg. . . . Come then to Augusta & as soon as you fix the time write to Gregg to meet us at Graniteville & we will go there from here on your return. I will go that far with you. . . . If such a Society³⁹ as you speak of should be formed I would

³⁹ The society which Hammond mentions here was eventually organized as The South Carolina Institute.

with pleasure deliver their anniversary & this will get me off from writing to Brisbane on the subject. Yet I would do anything in reason rather than mortify him. I think I understand him pretty well & really feel a great kindness for him.

.

Yours Ever

J. H. HAMMOND

[Short postscript omitted.]

[JAMES H. HAMMOND TO WILLIAM GILMORE SIMMS]

February 10, 1849

.
I am sorry for Brisbane. Don't let them mortify him. He is a good fellow—means well—perhaps does well as far as others are concerned in shooting beyond the mark. Such men are the true advance guard of civilization & in my opinion far more valuable than the mass of "practical men" who lag behind & gather the spoils of the victories they had had no hand in achieving.

Do let me know the first moment you can whether I am to deliver an Oration on "Machinery" & when it is to come off.

.

[WILLIAM GREGG TO JAMES H. HAMMOND]

Charleston Feby 18th 1849

Dear Sir

Your favour of the 13th inst came to hand in course. The number of bales of cotton of 400 lbs may be stated to average in S. C. 260, in Georgia 360,000. The quantity used on low numbers in the U States is about 400,000 bales in all the ballance of the world I suppose a million to 1200,000 bales of American cotton, the latter is however an opinion without any certain data

I have seen in some work the number of human labourers that the machinery of England supercedes; I cannot call the number to mind, & think that it is given in Ure. You had better not speake of water power except in general terms for it is a difficult subject to handle correctly, with all our experience we can only aproximate to the power at Graniteville, there are almost as many opinions with regard to the given quantity of power necessary to drive a hundred spindles, as there are districts of country engaged in manufacturing & to know how to write with safty on the subject it will be necessary to travel and mingle a great deal with those who deal in facts. You may start here & travel on to the state of Main[e] enquiring at every step & unless well guarded

with fixed notions one would be utterly confused, every section of country differ in opinion about the best Kind of water wheels, cards, pickes drawing frames, speeders, spindles dressers looms, belting & gearing is an other subject of controversy[.] water power compared with steam, all writers differ as to the quantity of machinery which will be driven by a given power, indeed it is necessarily so, for almost all mills differ in some particulars so that a writer taking any one establishment for a data would differ from a person taking another, either the spindles differ or some part of the preparation so as to vary very materially the result. Our ring spindles at Graniteville are supposed to require very little more than half the power necessary to drive dead spindles. We estimated our Turbine Wheel at 116 horses & supposed that it would carry very nearly the entire mill, I fear that that result will not be realized for with 4500 spindles & 100 Looms it was pretty nearly taxed to its power though not so near as to determine definitely. a few months more will start all our machinery when we will be able to make a certain calculation I have been for a long time endeavouring to find out what 116 horses power would drive recently requested the makers of our wheel to seek the information in Philadelphia, they refer me to authorities familiar to me & which I have doubted.

We have two wheels of Graniteville & suppose that either will drive nearly the whole mill.

I expect to go up to Graniteville on wednesday or thursday next & remain till sunday should like to see you then.

You will perceive that we have been defeated in our R Road election the ins took exception to our nomination on account of their not being qualified to act which took from us certainly 1500 Gadsden got 3500 Boman 1800 we had all the Banks, the City Council, Insurance companies & societies all the merchants the large stockholders, it is a triumph of which they have no right to boast. heretofore persons have been elected without reference to the stock they held afterwards qualifying by the purchase of stock. it is however contrary to the charter & had we elected our ticket the old members would have claimed the election. Many persons think that if I had been run singly against Gadsden that I would have carried the election easily.

I think any other than a Gadsden or a Holmes would resign after witnessing the odds against him. I think I proved to the Meeting that his machinery is not half worked & that the property has been depreciated more by wear & tear and neglect than all the exhibited profits amount to, stated that the very appearance of the whole concern was a blot on the character of our state. I understand that G regards the present as the greatest triumph ever gained in Charleston over the money power, the Bank of Charleston Ker Boyce Wm Gregg & the Graniteville Company.

The money power of our City has certainly not the connection with this interprise which usually exist in other Cities & I presume that it all results

from a want of confidence in its management, some singular facts were brought forth by this contest, one was that among our most interprising business men, persons suitable for President & directors could not be found who were holders of stock, that notwithstanding the stock has been constantly on our market at from 52½ to 60 cts, James Gadsden a wealth[y] man & who must be fully acquainted with the real worth of the stock has not added one cent in five years to his 108 shares of stock, so with Wade Hampton with his 60 shares Andrew Wallace a person so rich that he dont Know where to invest his capital 52 shares John Bryce 64—Robt worth a half million & who is constantly seeking sources of investment but 63—Ker Boyce worth a million 72 Wm Gregg 34—John Felyer [*sic*] & Co 30. shares Jas Adgur [*sic*] & Co worth a Million 20 shares—to see nearly the whole of the old Direction holding but little more than sufficient number of shares to entitle them to a seat & to ride free on the road speaks volumes, particularly when you couple with the fact, that these persons are never seen in the market or willing to touch the stock however low it may range. It is a fancy article, cracked up occasionally and well calculated to decoy the unwearied, many widows & orphans have suffered by this delusive source of sinking instead of making money, their litle all have in many instances been invested in this company by injudicious advisors who have been captivated by paper reports & newspaper puffs.

The company cannot pay a dividend in July & cannot see when they will be able unless they resort to borrowing for the outlays now indispensable will absorb a million of dollars & by the time that is fairly through with their Bonds will commence to mature 2,800,000

Yours truly

WM GREGG

Memmingers speeches are capital & must be spread far & wide, the idea referred to of that other legislature that sits in secret sessions involving the state in debts to the amt of millions is capital, & striking [*sic*], must go home to every man who reads

[HAMILTON SMITH TO JAMES H. HAMMOND]

Louisville Mch. 4/49

Dear Sir—

In ansr. to yrs. of 30th Jan. I forwarded you several papers on Manufactures, & have forgotten whether one on "Cotton & the only method of controlling its price" was sent. I mail it to you with this letter & would like to have your opinion on the views presented. I have *assumed* that the U. S. has the *monopoly* of raw cotton. Will the facts sustain the assumption? The character of the people & governments in S. Am. & Egypt must, as it seems to me, prevent any

increase of the staple in those countries & at present prices. I see no movement in either from which we may expect more system, or industry, or economical carriage.

The accounts given of the E. India cotton districts by Martin, Spry & others show clearly that we have but little to apprehend from that quarter. The reports made to Parliament from time to time & on this subject by men who are getting good salaries while the experiments are being made, I do not place much reliance on. What can be done in Australia I have no means of knowing.

I enclose you a letter of Ex-Pres. Tyler. The only objection he makes to my first proposition is that it would act as a bounty to foreign cotton growers. But if my figures in reference to the profits of manufacturing are correct (& I know they are) who could afford to give the bounty on the raw material & then compete with us in the product? England has not money enough to stand ten years of competition, &, unless I am vastly mistaken, English capital, labor & machinery will, in the next five years, be employed largely on the Ohio in competition with the capital labor & machinery of Manchester.

South Carolina can be made a more successful manufacturing state than Mass. &, when our Tenn. & Ky. rail roads are completed, I am not sure that we cannot profitably make cotton goods & ship them, via Charleston, to Europe. For manufacturing on a large scale we have advantages over you in our cheaper power (coal) & in cheaper subsistence. For a limited, neighborhood demand for food perhaps you could furnish a supply cheaper than ourselves.

I am somewhat inclined to follow up my propositions by a publication of all the leading facts & arguments bearing upon them & to show that the plantation States can be the most independent & prosperous district in the world. When I answered your letter it did not occur to me who you were & that I was addressing one of the most comprehensive minds of the South. If your leisure will allow I hope you will give me your views on the subject in extenso, for publication.

Very Respt., yr-obt-servt—

HAMILTON SMITH

[CHRISTOPHER G. MEMMINGER TO JAMES H. HAMMOND]

Charleston April 28, 1849.

My Dear Sir

I understand that you are preparing a review of Elwood Fisher's pamphlet, a work which I am very glad you have undertaken. As it is a subject in which we all feel a deep and common interest, I will venture to suggest one or two considerations to you, even at the hazard of suggesting what may have passed through your own mind.

Mr. Fisher has not noticed an important element which makes in favor of

the Slave interest. The products of slave labor are such as can never be the subjects of competition with white labor. Cotton and Rice are the products of Districts of Country where the white man cannot labor on account of malaria. They with Tobacco require cultivation during the whole summer with exposure to a summer's sun. The two chief of them are confined within geographical limits. The other products of agriculture upon which whites are employed are grains which are planted either in the fall or spring and require but little cultivation. There seems a necessity therefore, if the world must have Cotton, and if the Rice District is to be cultivated at all, that slave labor must be resorted to, and the whites can only be furnished with Cotton Fabrics at the cheap rates which now prevail, by the use of slave labor. Nay it is questionable, if slavery were abolished, whether the Cotton Crops would be worth noticing. For without the organized labor of the South, it could not be produced at all—and it is certain that the negroes themselves would never volunteer to raise it. No free negro now ever attempts such a thing. They generally go into other pursuits.

This leads me to another consideration, which is very important to us in this State and City. I find an opinion gaining ground that slaves ought to be excluded from mechanical pursuits, and everything but agriculture, so as to have their places filled with whites; and ere long we will have a formidable party on this subject. The planters generally do not perceive how it affects their interest, and very frequently chime in with this cry. I think our friend Gregg of Graniteville, with those who are agog about manufactures, without knowing it, are lending aid to this party, which is in truth, the only party from which danger to our Institutions is to be apprehended among us. Drive out negro mechanics and all sorts of operatives from our Cities, and who must take their place. The same men who make the cry in the Northern Cities against the tyranny of Capital—and there as here would drive all before them all who interfere with them—and would soon raise hue and cry against the Negro, and be hot Abolitionists—and every one of those men would have a vote. In our Cities, we see the operation of these elements—and if the eyes of the planting community are opened, the danger may be averted. Fill Barnwell District with some hundred Lowellers, and how do you think they will vote at elections. The scheme by which "Brutus" has expected to foment division among us is based on this element of Discord. For you know that even in our lower Country, there are many that could be Marshalled against the Planter, upon the idea that they were fighting against the aristocracy. These things I have no doubt you will keep in view. But I think you would do much good by giving a timely warning to our agricultural community—as every body will read your review.

Yours with much esteem

C. G. MEMMINGER

[WILLIAM GREGG TO JAMES H. HAMMOND]

Charleston May 30th 1849

My Dear Sir

I send you by to days mail Professor W. R. Johnsons address. You will get some good ideas from it. The freedom of thought and action of the present day removes from us the obstacles which many other countries have laboured against in attempting to revolutionise or improve modes [of] industry. Added to this we have wonderful advantages over the Eastern people in commencing the work. We are now just where they were in 1820 or 22 with this difference that they were dependant on England for machinery and skilled artisans—with the restrictive laws of England against them. We have the advantage of free intercourse and competition with the Eastern folk, and can procure their machinery as cheap as they can get it. Machinery mad[e] in Providence can be transported as cheaply to south Carolina as it can be taken to the interior of any of the Eastern or Northern states. And to obtain their most skilful artisans we have only to bid a little higher for them to avail ourselves of their most talented & best men. we can do in 12 years what they have been twenty eight in doing. The Augusta Charleston & Graniteville Mills when complete will contain 1000 looms capable of making 40,000 yards of cloth a day, this itself is a large commencement & has been done as we may say in a day. The State of Georgia has upwards of 2,000,000 of Charleston Capital employed in her various pursuits. Show our people profitable sources of investment and that capital will soon return. It would start 2,000 looms.

Graniteville Stock is above par. I offered yesterday myself 10 per cent advance for \$12,000 worth of it, to a person who had expressed a wish to sell, the offer was rejected. I really wished to make the purchase, & made the offer through a broker so that the party owning the Stock had no Knowledge of the source from which the bid came.

If this State of things continue to exist—there will be no want of capital to carry out similar enterprises.

Do you Know that the Northern people are running mad on the subject of plank roads. They are building them hundreds of miles in length & find them far cheaper than turnpiked McAdamized roads, to answer a better purpose for travel & freight, & pay a much better profit on the investment. Boyce & myself intend to apply to the Legislature for a charter to build one from Edgefield Ct House to Graniteville, which may be done for about 45 to \$50,000 & will pay better than a Rail Road which is property not worth owning except on great thorough fares & then they must be well managed or the wear and tear of road & Machinery will not only eat the profits but the capital. On plank roads the public sustain the loss by the wear of machinery, & the o[w]ners get pay in proportion to the wear of the road.

They travel 8 to 10 miles per hour on plank roads and as far as they have been tested in Canada N York &c they compensate for renewing once in 8 or 10 years & pay a fine per centage on investments.

My address has brought me Mr. Johnsons & quite a number of similar productions, two of the one I send you, those which I think will be useful to you I will send.

I have w[r]itten this in great haste not time to read it over just starting to Graniteville.

Yours truly

WM. GREGG

[JAMES H. HAMMOND TO WILLIAM GILMORE SIMMS]

Silver Bluff 4 June 1849

My dear Simms—

I have not touched the Manufacturing subject yet, but foresee I shall make a mess of it. I know nothing of the State of *feeling* in Charleston or State. I don't know how men talk, what they know, what they want, what would be new to them, what disgustingly common place. I could almost as well fashion a man for another planet as this speech for the *Mechanics* Institute. And these difficulties I have no means of over coming. Neither Gregg nor Brisbane will tell me what I want to know. They don't understand my wants at all. You I know have other fish to fry & I shall not talk [*sic*] of it—but take my chances. Bye the bye if this fair comes off before frost, it will be a purely Charleston affair & the up-coutry will not like to be *excluded*. It should have been later when no one would be afraid to go down. Cou[r]ts &c may interfere for ought I know, but if not, it should be put off until the 1st [*sic*] week in Nov. Don't say this *from me*.

Yours faithfully

J. H. HAMMOND

[WILLIAM GREGG TO JAMES H. HAMMOND]

Kalmia June 20th 1849

My Dear Sir

Your esteemed favour of 15th inst came to hand during the turmoil of settling up, packing & arranging matters to leave our Town home for the summer. . . .

I had no time before I left to procure the information you want relative to the cotton crop for twenty years back, the number of spindles in the south & quantity of cotton used &c I will attend to these matters soon.

The fair will be postponed untill November I trust for all who I have spoken to on the subject think it will be a more appropriate time.

I dont think I would touch the subject of black labour except in a general way as I attempted in my address, show how admirably we are situated with the african race to cultivate our swamps inhale the poisonous miasma of the same to indure the scorching sun necessary to the growth of cotton & other southern production, then speak of the anglo saxon race now among us & which would be invited to settle in our country by the many natural advantages which we have over the whole world as manufacturers particularly of cotton, the freest the hapiest & most independent people in the world our natural advantages will render it optional to what extent we undertake to work our raw material industry will always be remunerated by it. Our exclusive ability to raise good cotton to any great extent renders us the most independent people on the face of the Globe in time to be courted by Yankee English French German indeed all Nations that undertake to manufacture our raw material. Slavery or no slavery the Yankees will be glad to stick to us, & when the danger of disunion becomes serious they will revolutionise among themselves.

I would not decend to particulars about manufactures, the capital necessary to erect mills will run from 25 to \$30- & 35 per spindle \$40- of capital will be necessary to erect mills & furnish trading capital \$55 to 60- If negroes be purchased to work the mills.

Our goods at the South are always better than Northern or English, a simple reason may be assigned, purchase a bale for Graniteville & a similar one for a Northern English & German, our bale is taken immediately to the factory & is worked up without ever touching the ground or possibly getting a drop of rain on it.

The bale purchased for export is thrown on the Augusta wharf or in the Rail road yard where it may remain days & may be weeks to be eaten by the cows it is then put on an open car or boat exposed to rain and smoke it reaches Charleston (you can follow out the Savannah rout[e] It is tumbled off in the Rail Road Yard roled over in the mud a half doz doz [*sic*] times, it then lies may be ten days— by this time it is prety well torn & so besmeared that you would not Know it to be the same bale that started with ours. It next gets onto a dray & finds it[s] way to the wharf or cotton compressing yard where it gets another muddy ing but is here cut and carved & hand fulls puled out to sample, but is finally mended pressed & put on ship board possibly on deck it reaches N York or Boston where it again under goes the mud process & gouging by the samplers by this time it is prety well mudied roted & loses some of its

fat ness by the samplers hands. I must close for the mail bag is waiting.
below you have our last weekly return

Yours truly

WM GREGG

				<i>cost</i>		
<i>Looms</i>		<i>lbs. cloth</i>	<i>pieces</i>	<i>c Mills</i>	<i>Mill</i>	
48	4/4	3540	317	10302	4.8	41/100
202	7/8	12850	1798	42834	4.2	28/100
10	7/8 Drills	775	62	2077	5.2	58/100

The 4/4 is worth seven cents 7/8 six cents drills 8 cts.

[HAMILTON SMITH TO JAMES H. HAMMOND]

Louisville Aug. 14/49

Dear Sir—

I have just recd with delight your Review of Fisher's Pamphlett and, while I admire, I regret that so splendid a setting was just around a jewell in which there are so many flaws. Whatever credit Fisher may deserve, he has but little here [new?] as an honest compiler of statistics. I hope that your Review, conceived & executed in good temper, will reach the madmen of the north. We have just passed through a most exciting election & our people are weary of the slavery discussion; but I shall urge the Louisville Journal to copy a large part of your Article. The only way that we can bring the northern abolitionists to their senses is to show them, practically, that we can work up the great southern staple at & nearer the fields of its production.

By the by, look in Massingers Play "The Bondsman"—for the *rationale* of the power the master has over the slave—Act 4th Scene 2d.

I send you two articles of mine in the L-Journal in which you may find some statistics of interest to you—and some modifications of the Protective policy—as advocated in the West. My object was to excite discussion on the points presented, whereby the immense relative manufacturing advantages of the south & central West would be more clearly shown— You will, probably, differ in opinion from me—that this policy should be sustained by our Agriculturalists—but you will, doubtless, agree with me that *our* & *your* manufacturers are independent of a Tariff. With great respect—

I am yr-obt-servt-

HAMILTON SMITH

[WILLIAM GREGG TO WILLIAM B. SEABROOK]⁴⁰

Charleston May 10th 1850

Dear Sir

I received your esteemed communication requesting information on the subject of Manufactures. I should like very much to be with you a day at Graniteville, for I could there communicate more information verbally than could be written in a week. Enclosed I send a copy of a weekly report which is regularly transmitted to me at the end of each week and once a quarter to each individual stockholder, also a pamphlet written by myself which I beg you to peruse & I trust you will see the propriety of granting charters of incorporation. Georgia & many others of the States, have a general law on the subject of Charters. We ask for no aid from the State—no protection from Government, but simply the privilege & advantages granted in other states in the use of associated capital, which is absolutely necessary to the introduction of this branch of business, which in case of rupture with the General Government will be one of our strong arms of defence. Graniteville is now worked entirely by Natives except three Northern overseers, & we will soon be independent of them. You will perceive that we are making a very superior article of shirting & drills for a fraction less than $4\frac{1}{2}$ cts per lb, this fact of itself ought to disarm at once all opposition from those who fear that we may ultimately join the Northern people in a clamor for Government protection. The raw cotton cannot be purchased in Augusta and delivered to the spinner in Manchester without adding more than $4\frac{1}{2}$ cts per lb to its cost in the charges incident to its transit to that place.

You are at liberty to show the factory statement to your friends, but not to publish it, you can however state in any publication that we make our cloth for less than four and a half cents per pound for labour and all the expense incident to its manufacture.

While I would caution the state against extending pecuniary aid either in the shape of loans or otherwise, I think that you cannot too strongly recommend as liberal a policy as has been adopted in any other of our States towards such institutions. The clause in our Charter requiring all the capital to be paid in, will guard the public against all such losses as were sustained by the failure of the Nesbit Iron Manufacturing Company

I send you also a copy of our charter & the rules for the government of Graniteville. would like to see you and converse on the subject

I am every respectfully & truly

Your obt Servt

WM GREGG

⁴⁰ In Seabrook Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

[AMOS A. LAWRENCE TO WILLIAM GREGG]⁴¹

Boston, Aug. 21, 1850

Dear Sir

I take the liberty to send you a newspaper⁴² of two days since wh. contains an article on the cost of manufacturing at the South, wh. may not be correct, but wh. will have some interest for you.

This affords me an opportunity to acknowledge the pleasure with wh. I read two letters from you some time since in Hunts' magazine. The fairness with wh. you treated the subject of the relative advantages of the North & the South for manufacturing cotton, was in striking contrast to a great deal that has been written on that subject.

I hope the business of manufacturing is more successful with you than with us. At the present time we are in a sad condition. With a large stock of goods, enough for a supply of 6 mo, cotton high—out of reach, labor almost as high as it has ever been, & prices of the goods low & rather declining.

If it wd be of any interest to you, I shd be happy to give you the figures wh. show the cost of manufacturing any of the different kinds of cotton goods here, & the expense of selling them. Below is a small table of 7 companies in different parts of N. Eng. containing about 180,000 spindles on No. 14. If you please, I shd like to have the same from one or two of yr mills.

	<i>cott.</i>	<i>labr.</i>	<i>Reprs & all other expenses of manufacg.</i>	<i>cost per lb.</i>
1.	12.30	4.33	2.32	18.95
2.	11.62	4.56	2.30	18.48
3.	11.46	4.64	2.44	18.54
4.	12.18	3.89	2.38	18.45
5.	11.17	3.94	2.30	17.41
6.	12.54	4.	2.20	18.74
7.	13.65	3.92	1.74	19.31

The cottn is with the waste out. The goods are sheetings & drillings weighg from 2.77 yds to the lb to 2.95.

The price of the goods is now 7½ cts. [illegible] from wh. ½ ct must be taken for interest commisns &c. This cost was from Jany to July: *now* the cotton stands higher. These were all good mills & under good management.

I think the only remedy is such a continued high price of cotton as will oblige us to stop manufacturing.

Very Respectfully & truly Yours

AMOS A. LAWRENCE

⁴¹ In Lawrence Papers (Massachusetts Historical Society Library, Boston). Permission to publish is hereby gratefully acknowledged.

⁴² This was a copy of the Boston *Daily Advertiser*, August 20, 1850.

[WILLIAM GREGG TO AMOS A. LAWRENCE]⁴³

Kalmia Sept 2nd 1850

Dear Sir

Your favour of 21st ulto is before me & also the newspaper containing the articles on Southern manufacturing. The writer of the last article who professes to be a practical manufacturer, and one who has recently visited the southern States, is correct in many of his remarks, and certainly gives a graphic description of the condition of some of our small mills, but upon the whole exhibits a total ignorance of southern character & the capacity of the poor of our country to compete with the Yankees in manufacturing, the present state of our manufactories and the appearance and condition of the operations is not the result of any deficiency on the part of our people. It is just such a state of things as generally follow the introduction of manufactures in any country, his description of southern factories & operatives might well be applied to Rhode Island when manufactures were first introduced and as to dirt grease & the working of small children will now apply to many old mills in that section of country. It would have been better before the Gentleman attempted to write on the subject to have visited Graniteville & some others of our more recently erected establishments, where advantage has been taken of the lights which Massachusetts has shed upon the subject. Graniteville has three hundred looms in operation on 37 inch sheetings 30 in shirtings & drills No 14, our goods are known in Charleston, New York & Philadelphia to be among the best made in the U States, and from the statement inclosed you will perceive, are turned off at a cost of 3 80/100 per lb for labour which is a fraction under your lowest figures. We commenced to build G'ville this spring four years ago & had the mill in full operation first July 1849. From the day we commenced we have never had the slightest difficulty in procuring hands who our overseers (Eastern men) pronounce to be equal to any in the Eastern States. Nearly all of our hands live under parental care, and occupy about 85 cottages erected by the company for the purpose, each cottage has from an acre to an acre & a half of ground attached to it, and the occupants seldom move, so that we have an extraordinary steady set of workers, we allow no *alcohol* to be used in the place, make it a part of the leasehold that parents shall send their children between the ages of six & twelve constantly to school, tuition furnished free of charge, so you will perceive that persons of tender age are not worked in the mill. The factory buildings are of Granite airy and commodious, the yards in front covering about 4 acres ornamented with shrubbery grass lawns and broad handsomely graded walks, far surpassing in this particular any thing that can be seen in N England about the manufacturing establishments, some money has been spent in this operation, but nothing lost to the company, for it has

⁴³ Lawrence Papers,

removed at once the impression which had been made in the minds of those who ought to be employed in such establishments by the cramped up dirty greasy mills which seems to have made such a strong impression on the mind of the Gentleman who wrote the article alluded to. Graniteville has a Hotel, two churches, five mercantile establishments, besides smiths, shoe & hat makers &c, & presents to the eye of a stranger a picture quite as handsome as can be found in New England, no one can visit the place without being struck with the air of neatness and comfort which meets the eye in every direction, and it is indeed strictly speaking a town of industry.

I dont think that you Eastern manufacturers need have any fears of serious competition from the South, for such investments are slowly made in all countries where manufactures are introduced, as the gentleman observes you will build up a town in two years which will outnumber all the spindles now in the south in motion or contemplated to be erected for ten years to come, it is now four years and a half since we commenced Graniteville besides which there has been but three thousand spindles put in operation in South Carolina during that period. Georgia has done more, but all that has been done in that state in five years will not be equivalent to the one mill recently started at Hadley falls. We have however all the requisites of success, and the business is destined to progress at the south, it will however be so gradual that we will not be seriously felt on your heels, you will by imperceptible degrees have gone onto goods which will not be made here for a half century to come, we will not probably in our day attempt anything finer than No. 14.

A reasonable tariff of protection would set evry thing right at this time, but unfortunately for the country, just when the south was ready to receive reasonable propositions on this head, you people of the North, East, & West, raise up a bone of contention which has spoiled all, it is mere phathom, an abstraction to you New England people, who I had hoped had too much hard common sense to run mad about. Universal freedom is a hacknied theme with you, & the people seem to be boiling over with patriotism, it is a great pity that your emancipators had not turned their efforts of philanthropy to the relief of the poor oppressed Irish & English where great good can be done without invading the right of property. With us, slaves are property, and it amounts to Many Millions, the protection & free use of which is guaranteed to us by the Constitution, without that protection the Union is of no use to us. I am sorry to confess to you that among our best men here, a severance of the Union is desirable, & I believe this sentiment to be almost universal in south Carolina & Georgia, the old substantial men who stood up for union during Nulification, are now on the other side. We are under the impression here, that the spirit of abolition is becoming so rife with you that it will over ride the politicians and wise men of the country, and that the day is not distant when it would be a hopeless

case with us to look for redress should a vessel belonging to any other nation land on our coast & take away five hundred or a thousand of our Negroes. I fear that many years of negotiations would be resorted to before the Eastern people would be willing to cripple their commerce by war in such a cause particularly if it were with such a powerful nation as England, while the invasion of a yankee fishing smack would set you in a flame. Our distrust does not end here, we look forward to the possibility that the mad spirit of abolition may lead to still more disastrous results, that the money which we contribute to the support of government may in time be used against us to take away our property, a lawless majority is seldom governed by principles. We all know that laws are only binding when sanctioned by public opinion. Constitutions are but ropes of sand when their provisions are contrary to the dictates of a sense of justice, and the consciences of those who have the power to trample them under foot.

I trust that you will not regard this digression in a personal light, the subject has caused me much painful anxiety, it is a candid confession of not only mine, but the sentiments of thousands around me, made in a spirit of kindness, believing that your enlightened people are deplorably ingnoant [*sic*] not only of the condition of the Slaves at the South, but of the state of public sentiment throughout the southern states relative to the value of the Union to us & its permanency as a Government.

My post office is at Graniteville from June to November in the winter Charleston.

I am With great respect

Your obt servt

WM GREGG

Cost-Per Pound for Week Ending August 17th 1850

Picking	Cost	Per	Pound	0	0	99
Carding	"	Do		0	7	66
Spinning	"	Do		0	6	22
Spoolg. Warp	& Dressing	Do		0	4	91
Weaving	"	Do		1	7	37
Baleing	"	Do		0	0	97
				<hr/>		
				3	8	12

The above is a fair average statement of the Cost of our Goods per pound. Mr Gregg will be happy to furnish Mr L with any further statements should he desire it.

B. C. HARD Clerk

Gran. Manf. Co

SOME ADDENDA TO "WALTER LYNWOOD FLEMING:
HISTORIAN OF RECONSTRUCTION"

BY FLETCHER M. GREEN

In November, 1936, the present writer published in *The Journal of Southern History* (Vol. II, pp. 497-521), an essay on Walter Lynwood Fleming, together with a bibliography of his writings. Recently, he discovered that he had omitted from the bibliography several items published by Dr. Fleming. Of particular significance are the articles in *The Dial: A Fortnightly Journal of Literary Criticism, Discussion, and Information*, 86 vols. (Chicago, 1880-1929). For the benefit of students of Fleming and of Reconstruction history, and that the bibliography may be more nearly complete, he submits the following Addenda to Fleming's writings.

Incidentally, it might not be amiss to call attention to the value of *The Dial* to students of southern and general United States history. For nearly a quarter of a century *The Dial* was made up largely of contributions from the pens of distinguished American historians. Their contributions consist of review articles and original studies dealing with history in all its aspects. And one will find a single volume of the journal containing contributions of Carl L. Becker, Isaac J. Cox, Walter L. Fleming, Fred M. Fling, James W. Garner, Frederic A. Ogg, Grant Showerman, David Y. Thomas, and Payson J. Treat. Throughout its existence leading historians contributed to its columns. In addition to the above, such prominent historians as Annie Heloise Abel, Ephraim D. Adams, Charles A. Beard, Frank W. Blackmar, Henry E. Bourne, William E. Dodd, W. E. Burghardt Du Bois, Alice Morse Earle, Matthew B. Hammond, Charles H. Haskins, Frank H. Hodder, J. Franklin Jameson, Rossiter Johnson, Laurence M. Larson, Charles H. McIlwain, Frank L. McVey, Shailer Mathews, Milo M. Quaife, Paul S. Reinsch, St. George L. Sioussat, Edwin Erle Sparks, and Frederick Jackson Turner were frequent contributors.

- Walter Lynwood Fleming contributed nineteen articles, as follows:
- "The Seaboard Slave States," XXXVII (No. 439, October 1, 1904), 203-205.
- "Negro Slavery in Illinois," XXXVII (No. 442, November 16, 1904), 307-310.
- "A Woman's Reminiscences of Peace and War," XXXVIII (No. 446, January 16, 1905), 43-44.
- "Southern Life in War Time," XXXVIII (No. 454, May 16, 1905), 347-49.
- "An Investigation of Lynching in the United States," XXXIX (No. 458, July 16, 1905), 34-36.
- "War-Time Memories of a Confederate's Daughter," XXXIX (No. 465, November 1, 1905), 269-70.
- "Washington as Housekeeper and Farmer," XLI (No. 488, October 16, 1906), 237-38.
- "After the War in Dixie," XLI (No. 489, November 1, 1906), 274-76.
- "War Memories of a Confederate Leader," XLII (No. 503, June 1, 1907), 332-35.
- "The South Since the War," XLIII (No. 513, November 1, 1907), 281-82.
- "America's First Representative Body," XLVI (No. 547, April 1, 1909), 226-27.
- "An American Soldier and Mystic," XLVIII (No. 573, May 1, 1910), 317-19.
- "The Negro Problem Viewed Across the Color Line," XLVIII (No. 574, May 16, 1910), 357-59.
- "The Problems of the South: An English View," XLIX (No. 581, September 1, 1910), 114-15.
- "Men and Manners of Colonial Virginia," L (No. 590, January 16, 1911), 48-51.
- "A Library in a Powder Magazine," LIII (No. 629, September 1, 1912), 127.
- "General Grant's Letters," LIV (No. 643, April 1, 1913), 301-302.
- "Our South American Neighbors," LIX (No. 700, September 2, 1915), 150-51.
- "Slave-Holding Indians in the Civil War," LIX (No. 701, September 16, 1915), 216-18.

An additional item which should also be included in the Fleming bibliography is:

- "Zachary Taylor, 1784-1850," in *Library of Southern Literature*, compiled under the direction of Southern Men of Letters, edited by Edwin Anderson Alderman and Joel Chandler Harris, 16 vols. (Atlanta: The Martin and Hoyt Company, 1910), XII, 5217-19.

Book Reviews

The Colonial Agents of the Southern Colonies. By Ella Lonn. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1945. Pp. vii, 438. Appendices, bibliography. \$5.00.)

Dr. Lonn has brought to this study of the colonial period the same mastery of historical technique that has characterized her work on the Civil War. Friends of her other books will find here the same attention to detail, the same logical development, and the same analysis as in them, despite the fact that the subject is of less inherent interest than some of her Civil War studies.

She explains her venture into this new field in an introduction. All but one packet of notes on the colonial agent, taken early in her career, were destroyed by fire, and some years later in London when she found that no one had yet worked up the subject she completed the research on it in British archives before returning to the United States. She has limited the study to the southern agent because of the work already done on the more familiar of the northern agents.

The first two chapters describe the origins and development of the agency, the last evaluates the institution, and between them are analytical chapters describing the agent and his work. Although there is one chapter on the special agent, the study properly deals almost entirely with the regularly appointed agent, who had a salary and fixed term of office.

The office of the agent was a natural development in the very early colonial period. The first, John Pountis, was appointed by Virginia in 1624 to present the case of the colony against the abrogation of its charter. From that time to the beginning of the Revolution, over one hundred regular and special agents served the colonies. The development of the agency followed very much the same pattern as did the colonies themselves in their relations with each other and with the mother country, and the agents suffered from much the same dissensions. The assembly and council quarreled over the appointment of the agent on numerous occasions in colonial history, and in Virginia between 1761 and 1772 each body was represented in London by its own. The colonial governor was interested in the agents, and the Board of Trade also had a concern, with the result that the office reflected many of the conflicts of imperial and colonial politics. As the colonies matured and began to work somewhat more closely together, the several agents began to concert their actions, and by the

time of the Revolution there were almost regularly scheduled meetings of the agents in London.

The duties of the office were so extensive that few agents had the knowledge or ability to meet all the demands upon them. The agent was expected to look after the interests of the colony he represented. He needed to be conversant with conditions in his own colony and in America and England in general. He was an ambassador of good will to protect the colony at every point. He defended its laws, encouraged its trade, obtained what favors he could for it, and fought for its interests before the numerous boards in England which had dealing with the colonies.

The agent who tried conscientiously to do his job—and most of them did reasonably well at it—was overworked and underpaid. The annoyances, frustrations, and difficulties were many, the rewards few, and the salary slight. Yet the colonies could get surprisingly good men to take the appointment. Indeed, they fought for it. Among the two hundred colonial agents from all colonies there were many obscure men, but there were also some famous Americans and Englishmen. Benjamin Franklin, William Byrd II, John and Peyton Randolph, Sir Henry Ashurst, and Edmund Burke are simply the more striking of a number of able men who undertook the responsibilities of the office. Why, in view of such difficulties and such poor returns? Probably because the eighteenth century was a time when men believed greatly in "influence" and position. Everyone was rated in part by the number of government posts and appointments he had, and even important people eagerly sought minor posts to add to their list. Things were done by influence, by knowing the right people, and the more contacts one had, the more officials one knew, the more boards one had access to, the more influential one was.

In spite of the quality of the men on the job, in spite of the need for it, the agency was not a successful institution. A careful and honest checking of the results leads Dr. Lonn to the conclusion that the successes of the agents were less striking than their failures. Although a balance sheet would show a deficit, there are substantial credits. Agents did affect both British and colonial legislation and to an important degree they opened the lines of communication between the colony and the people of Great Britain. There is enough on the credit side, in fact, to justify not only the colonies' maintaining the agency but also the author's venture into this aspect of colonial history.

Vanderbilt University

PHILIP DAVIDSON

The James, from Iron Gate to the Sea. By Mrs. Blair Niles. (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1945. Pp. xii, 335. Maps, illustrations, bibliography. \$2.50.)

This book differs from *The James*, an earlier book by Mrs. Niles, in two noteworthy respects. Accounts of certain episodes that occurred above the falls

of the river have been added and the rest of the book has been improved by a rearrangement of chapters and paragraphs. The additions include chapters on Nathaniel Bacon, William Byrd II, and Alexander Spotswood. They were added, presumably, because these men promoted westward migrations that eventually extended into the valley of the upper James. Another new chapter is "Looney's Ferry." It contains brief remarks on the frontier activities of James Patton, John Buchanan, and several other settlers who drove the Indians from the mountains drained by the James, but it is chiefly devoted to the hardships of Hannah Dennis, a white woman who was captured by the Indians. Then, too, there is a chapter on the James River and Kanawha Canal. "It was not lonesome on the river in those days." The chapter on immigration in the earlier book has been expanded to include a brief account of the laboring classes in the colony. The rearrangement gives some continuity to the union of the old material with the new; but the book still remains essentially fragmentary and episodic.

Both books contain sketches or episodes involving Captain John Smith, Pocahontas, Washington, Jefferson, Robert E. Lee, Edgar Allen Poe, Matthew F. Maury, Miss Lasalle Corbell (later the wife of General Pickett), and the wife of General Roger Pryor. Both books end as if the valley of the James ceased to produce great men and women about seventy-five years ago. Hence Mrs. Niles fails to give an adequate description of Virginia today in its relation to its past. This omission accentuates the sentimental and lavish affection for the quaint splendor of plantation days displayed in the book, but it does not do justice to men and women who have lived in Virginia since the Civil War. A brief mention is made of Maggie Walker, a Richmond Negress who established a bank, and of Carter Glass, W. A. R. Goodwin, Douglas Freeman, Ellen Glasgow, and Mary Johnston. Their achievements are not evaluated, however, and many other persons influential in the history of Virginia are omitted entirely. Edwin A. Alderman was probably a more capable educational administrator than was Thomas Jefferson. Dr. Walter Reed, whose experiments led to the control of yellow fever, was born only a short distance from the James. Riddleberger, Mahone, John E. Massey, and Harry Flood Byrd represented significant moods of Virginians on Capitol Hill overlooking the James.

The James, from Iron Gate to the Sea is written in as clear and easy a style as *The James*. It contains some rather trivial accounts, but there are no dull passages. It is entertaining and should be popular. Mrs. Niles' literary skill is the chief merit of the book.

The most serious fault in the book, perhaps, is an excessive use of dramatic episodes. They are interesting, of course, but something more is needed for the writing of a well-balanced history. The effects of the navigation acts upon the colony, the low price of tobacco as a cause of the discontent that manifested

itself in Bacon's Rebellion, the latest biography of Bacon by Thomas J. Wertenbaker, land speculation as a cause of the American Revolution, and the economic interpretation of the Constitution of the United States are ignored. Slavery did not cause Virginia to enter the Civil War, because "scarcely one in thirty of the soldiers of Virginia had ever owned a slave, or ever expected to" (p. 253). Mrs. Niles blames the New England traders for the introduction of slaves and stresses the many benefits the Negroes derived from the affectionate, patient care bestowed upon them by the southern master.

Errors slip into all books. In a quotation the date of an Indian massacre is given as 1640, when the reference was undoubtedly to the massacre of 1644 (p. 85). An account of a law against the wearing of finery is placed so that it appears to have been enacted for the first time much later in the seventeenth century than 1619 (p. 79). In both books it is stated that Lafayette returned to the United States in 1824 and that this date was thirty-five years after he had fought beside Washington in the Revolution (p. 224; *The James*, pp. 195-96). The need of labor for cotton plantations is given as one of the causes of the beginning of slavery in the southern colonies, though cotton was exported hardly at all until after 1790.

The book contains a number of quotations, but no footnotes. It has a selected bibliography and a usable index. It contains black and white illustrations by Edward Shenton.

Mary Washington College

ROBERT L. HILLDRUP

Lincoln Bibliography, 1839-1939. Volumes I and II. Compiled by Jay Monaghan, with a foreword by James G. Randall. *Collections of the Illinois State Historical Library*, Volumes XXXI and XXXII; *Bibliographical Series*, Volumes IV and V. (Springfield: Illinois State Historical Library, 1943 [c.1945], 1945. Pp. xiv, 519, xi, 560. \$5.00 the set.)

There has long been a crying need for a scholarly Lincoln bibliography, one that would codify the earlier guides of Fish, Oakleaf, and Starr, supplement them with new material, and draw the diverse and scattered threads of "Lincolniana" into a single pattern. With the appearance of Mr. Monaghan's two-volume work the need has been substantially met. Historians and Lincoln students owe a debt of gratitude to the compiler and to his sponsor, the Illinois State Historical Library, that notable center of Lincoln investigation.

Before compiling the bibliography, Mr. Monaghan had to settle on a definition of what constituted Lincolniana. He accepted one prepared by Theodore C. Pease and Paul M. Angle. It is best quoted: "All printed books and pamphlets dealing principally with (1) Abraham Lincoln (2) his ancestry (3) his wife, children, stepmother and sister (but excluding material relating to the individual career of Robert T. Lincoln) or (4) having the name of

Abraham Lincoln prominently in their titles; excluding all material appearing in periodicals and separates of periodical articles printed for private distribution by the author of the article, unless title page, type or pagination are different from the original printing, and unless prefatory material has been added; excluding all general histories of the United States, of the Civil War, or of Illinois, no matter how prominently the part of Lincoln in them; excluding all published sources dealing incidentally with Lincoln's life, such as the Welles and Browning diaries; excluding all distinctly advertising bulletins, pamphlets, and pictures, menus, programs of school exercises, etc., except where they contain sufficient informational material to render them of permanent value" (pp. xxvi-xxvii). With this definition as a working basis, Mr. Monaghan proceeded to examine the principal Lincoln collections, public and private, in the country. He has described his methodology and experiences in an informative introduction that includes a history of previous Lincoln bibliographies.

There are 3,958 titles, some of which are variants, in the bibliography. They are listed alphabetically, by author or by title, if anonymous, for each year from 1839 to 1939. Each title is followed by a descriptive paragraph. A sample item may yield such information as name of the author and publisher, leaf measurements, number of pages, reprints and editions, the identification number used by Fish, Oakleaf, and Starr if the title appeared in the earlier guides, and a location symbol showing where a copy of the work may be found. To some entries, those whose titles are not self-explanatory, a second paragraph has been added summarizing the contents of the work. Each entry is preceded by an identification number. The index, which is arranged alphabetically by author or title, cites to page numbers instead of identification numbers.

In some respects this guide will be of greater aid to collectors than to historians. Mr. Monaghan's limited definition imposes certain limitations upon his bibliography. Most magazine material is excluded by the definition. So also are such vital Lincoln source materials as the diaries of Welles, Browning, and Bates, which are certainly essential to a study of the Lincoln theme. The definition makes necessary the inclusion of a tremendous number of titles that can only be classified as historical trash. Mr. Monaghan has had the courage and wisdom to throw out some of this, including some Lincoln-day addresses designed to prove that Lincoln would have voted for some particular candidate in a current election, but a lot of it remains in. This is not said in criticism of Mr. Monaghan or his definition. Having accepted a definition, he did right to hew to it, even though some of the results are of doubtful value. A broader and more subjective definition or a more discriminating selection might have involved him in an endless task. It would certainly have involved him in quarrels with reviewers who, like the present one, would have been quick to charge that some of his titles were not genuine Lincolniana. And it is not Mr. Mon-

aghan's fault if much of the writing about Lincoln is trashy. Nevertheless, historians should realize the limitations of the bibliography.

Mr. Monaghan, as he has demonstrated in other writings, has a brilliant historical style. He has managed to introduce touches of it even into a bibliography. Some of the descriptive paragraphs are gems of humor.

Louisiana State University

T. HARRY WILLIAMS

A House Dividing: Lincoln as President Elect. By William E. Baringer. (Springfield: The Abraham Lincoln Association, 1945. Pp. ix, 356. Illustrations, bibliography. \$4.00.)

The author properly feels called upon to legitimate his main title with a restrictive subtitle and with prefatory assertions that this "is not a history of the United States, November 6, 1860 to March 5, 1861," and that the story of the many compromise ventures "is told only as they related to the President Elect." The narrative is therefore confined to Lincoln's work as an "apprentice cabinet-maker," to his indecisive brush-off of the compromisers, to his trip to Washington for the inauguration, and to bulletin service on his growing whiskers. The organization is chronological, almost day by day.

Mr. Baringer uses the dispatches of Henry Villard to the New York *Herald* as a kind of framework to which he adds substance from letters, diaries, memoirs, speeches, biographies, and newspapers. His research in manuscripts has been extensive, and his arrangement is orderly. He quotes with such frequency that quotations form a substantial portion of the book; but to this the historical reader will hardly object, for the material is always appropriate and the continuity usually good. The reader may, however, be overwhelmed by the importunities of office-seekers; if so, it is because Lincoln himself was overwhelmed. The fourteen weeks of the life of the President Elect in Springfield were fourteen weeks of siege; the assaulting forces were members of his own party, invited and uninvited, welcome and unwelcome, conservatives and radicals, representatives of all the free states and some of the slave states, and virtually all covetous of some corner of the inner works. The reader is tempted to compassion for the President Elect, as for the victim of a plague, until he recalls that the Lincoln forces drafted the Republican convention rather than the convention drafting Lincoln.

The strength of this book lies in its revelation of Lincoln's temperament and sagacity as he underwent the ordeal of cabinet-making, in its view of the rather frightening power of the patronage, and in its implicit suggestion that Lincoln's trip to Washington marked a distinct forward step in his approach to coercion. The response to Lincoln's appeals for loyalty to the Union, appeals made all along his circuitous route to the Capital, made him aware for the first time of the extent to which some Northerners were discussing the preservation

of the Union in military terms. This trip, incidentally, Mr. Baringer recounts in some detail, even to maiden kissing and whisker explaining. He suggests the full measure of the Democratic taunts occasioned by Lincoln's ride into Washington "like a thief in the night," but he does not reveal the extent of Democratic ridicule of his "incautious" remarks en route. Nor does he mention the Democratic glee over Lincoln's alleged blunder in Pittsburgh: pointing across the Monongahela and addressing the "Virginians" on the farther shore.

The weakness of the author's craftsmanship lies in his doubtful fidelity to his evidence and in his occasional carelessness in writing. Did Lincoln declare that the factional struggle over the patronage strained his sanity (p. 152)? Possibly, but that is not a fair interpretation of Lincoln's letter to Seward of January 12. Did the Washington reporter of the New York *Herald* actually see Lincoln's letter to Cameron of December 31 (p. 155)? Perhaps so, but the quoted evidence is inconclusive. More important points are also involved. Did the responses to Trumbull's sounding-board speech of November 20 prove that "Lincoln was wise in his refusal to express himself prematurely on the crisis" (p. 40)? Baringer lists seven "reactions." Five of these approve the content of the speech, while two, those of the New York *Herald* and the New Orleans *Daily Crescent*, respectively ask for conservative declarations from Lincoln himself and deny that good could come from Trumbull's "vague assurances" of protection for rights "he did not clearly define." This evidence does not warrant the author's conclusion in this highly significant matter of policy. Did Lincoln hope that Seward would decline his invitation to become Secretary of State (p. 89)? Baringer's thesis, apparently original, appears to rest on no more than its plausibility and the suppositions of Edward Bates. Was the patronage fight "a battle for control of the party within the various Republican states," rather than a contest of radicals versus conservatives or of old Whigs versus old Democrats (p. 152)? Baringer thinks so and submits New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois in proof, but he neglects the thirteen remaining Republican states. Furthermore, he speaks repeatedly of interstate combinations; he declares that Lincoln "placed emphasis on his intention to include both Whig and Democratic elements, on as even a basis as possible" (p. 88); and he makes other prejudicial assertions, as, for instance, that "only Chase could reconcile the anti-Seward men of New York . . . to Seward's selection as State secretary" (p. 160). Perhaps a fair conclusion would be that Baringer has somewhat modified rather than supplanted the other theses. Finally, does the author fairly evaluate his evidence when he says that "the traditional view that Lincoln 'stood like a rock' against compromise is an oversimplification leading to a conclusion far closer to error than to truth" (p. 337)? Lincoln blew cold and cool, emphatically denouncing all compromise and yet making some devious soundings on minor concessions.

Emphatically, he was not a compromiser in the language of the day. Perhaps the reader can only conclude that the obscurity of Lincoln's exact position warrants the obscurity of Baringer's characterization.

Carelessness in phrasing appears in constructions like these: "The rumored purpose of the visitor's mission, who had been known as 'one of the most immovable of the Republican members . . . , produced no little amazement' " (p. 222). "Concluding by stating that he would deliver an address next morning, the crowd gave three cheers for the 'Union as it is' " (p. 277). Too many others could be added. There is carelessness—not error or ambiguity—in citation. Browning's *Diary* is cited in four forms, the *Diary* of Bates and the *Memoirs* of Villard in three forms each. There is some inconsistency in capitalization and about the usual number of slips in proof reading. "David H. Potter" is written for David M. Potter (pp. 44, 346). In the bibliography, both Arabic and Roman numerals are used to indicate volume. The *Diary* of Bates, unlike that of Chase, is not listed as a publication of the American Historical Association.

Mr. Baringer reveals his admiration for Lincoln through his selection of materials and through certain *ex parte* assumptions. His evidence has been taken largely from friendly sources, and the dispatches of the appreciative Villard form the backbone of the story. The use of "appeasement" and "bribe" in speaking of compromise is to express a Republican judgment; and the same is true of the insistence that the enforcement of federal laws did not constitute coercion. The author's predilections, however, never become offensive; he has, in fact, written with considerable objectivity, certainly as much as any reader should expect from the Director of the Abraham Lincoln Association, and perhaps as much as he should expect from any historian who knows the accumulated testimony of a hundred years.

A House Dividing offers more to those whose interest is "Lincoln as President Elect" than it does to those whose interest is the "history of the United States, November 6, 1860 to March 5, 1865." That, of course, was Baringer's expectation. Carman and Luthin's *Lincoln and the Patronage* is broader and more objective; and it better integrates Lincoln's problems of the patronage and the preservation of the Union. Potter's *Lincoln and His Party in the Secession Crisis* is, as it should be, a better study of Lincoln's part in formulating a Union-preserving program, and, in a sense, it is more creditable to Lincoln himself, for it attributes to him a positive policy in place of the rather negative one presented by Baringer. *A House Dividing* is better written than the same author's *Lincoln's Rise to Power*, but it is distinctly less of a contribution to American history.

The Coosa River Valley from De Soto to Hydroelectric Power. By Hughes Reynolds. (Cynthiana, Kentucky: The Hobson Book Press, 1944. Pp. xxvi, 351. Illustrations, appendix, bibliography. \$3.00.)

Personal experiences and oft-heard yarns inspired Mr. Reynolds, a native of Rome, Georgia, to collect this assortment of traditional tales, which he has woven around a framework of facts in the history, geography, and economics of the Coosa River Valley. He presents them with the relish of one who loves local history. Scattered here and there throughout this collection, which, according to the author, is not a work of "profound research," are nuggets of quiet humor and bits of local color. The resultant potpourri should be of special interest to residents of the Coosa Valley and contiguous territory.

Despite its apparent breadth, the title of the book is aptly chosen. The author begins with a description of De Soto's travels in Georgia and Alabama, and closes with a prophecy of industrial development and a plea for co-operation in the control of floods and erosion. In his progress from a narrative of the wanderings of De Soto through this "enchanted land" to a statement of his personal views on that most perplexing of southern problems, the perennial question of race relations, the author touches at many familiar points—the French at Mobile, Alexander McGillivray, Weatherford, "the Red Eagle," Fort Mims and the Creek war, "Old Hickory" and the Bentons, "Nolichucky Jack," Nathan Bedford Forrest and Emma Sansom, the gallant Pelham, steam-boating men, the code duello, and Martha Berry.

Perhaps the most significant portion of the book is the final section, in which the author states his views on the status of the Negro and on industrialization. He insists that although great progress has been made in meeting the difficulties inherent in bi-racial society, southern whites must face the inconsistency in a society which sends its sons to fight for freedom and democracy in foreign lands while it maintains the caste system at home. There is, he says, no "way out." There is only a "way on." He urges the Southerners to forget Reconstruction, to cease their talk of "colonial status," and to look forward to a great future in industrial development.

This work probably will be of more value to the sociologist than to the historian.

United States Army

HENRY L. SWINT

Fighting Liberal: The Autobiography of George W. Norris. With an introduction by James E. Lawrence. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1945. Pp. xviii, 419. Illustrations. \$3.50.)

This posthumously published autobiography of the great liberal senator from Nebraska was written during the period following his retirement from the Sen-

ate after his defeat in the election of 1942. The task of its preparation was undertaken as a result of appeals from a large number of people, and especially the earnest solicitation of an editor-friend, James E. Lawrence of Lincoln, Nebraska. It appears that Mr. Lawrence served somewhat in the capacity of a "ghostwriter," and he is given "unlimited credit" by the author "for his work of research, editing, and rearranging the material in its present form."

Although Senator Norris depended largely upon his memory, he and Mr. Lawrence appear to have made considerable use of the *Congressional Record* and other contemporary sources. As would naturally be expected there is no bibliography. The purpose of the author was to recount the more important battles in the interest of liberalism in which he engaged during forty years of public service, particularly those "which may prove of lasting consequence," and to clarify and justify the basic principles which motivated his action.

Because of limitations of space only the more important issues could be given detailed treatment, particularly Norris' fights against Cannonism, machine politics, and the "yellow dog" contracts, his championing of TVA, the "lame duck" amendment, and the unicameral legislature, and his attitude toward the two world wars. There is some evidence that "hindsight" was not without effect on his recollections of earlier events. Nevertheless, at the time of writing he was still sure that he had been right in his opposition to our entrance into the First World War and to the League of Nations, although he had recently supported the Lend-Lease Bill, the declarations of war against the Axis, and efforts in the direction of a new organization of nations.

Students of southern history will be particularly interested in learning why a resident of Nebraska should have become the "Father of TVA." The fundamental reason for Norris' interest in the development of the Tennessee Valley appears to have been his earlier conclusion that the irrigation dains along the Missouri River were of immense benefit in mitigating flood damages along the Mississippi and should therefore be financed in part from the national treasury. Supporting the decision of the Supreme Court in the Ashwander case, he contends that his main purposes in sponsoring the TVA legislation were flood control and navigation improvement, and only incidentally the production of electric power. Only the federal government was in a position to provide satisfactorily for the multi-purpose development of such a great river as the Tennessee, especially since the "private power companies never offered to develop the stream which they desired to prevent the government from touching." His attitude toward the power companies was also influenced, it seems, by his acquaintance with the obstructive tactics which have succeeded from 1913 to the present day in preventing the "Hetch Hetchy" development in California.

Having begun life as a farm boy and served for many years in the national legislature as a representative of farmers, Senator Norris was vitally interested

in lightening the burdens of farm men and women through the magic of electricity, and was therefore a vigorous sponsor of the REA as a supplement to TVA. Other southern issues upon which Norris' position is explained in *Fighting Liberal* are the poll tax and anti-lynching legislation. He considered anti-poll tax legislation by Congress constitutional and necessary, but strangely viewed laws against lynching unconstitutional (here he calls attention to a typographical error in the *Congressional Record*) and unwise.

Although this autobiography does not provide much information not previously known concerning the career of Norris or the legislative contests in which he engaged, it is nevertheless a spirited presentation of the liberal point of view in American politics. That Norris was able to maintain himself in office for such a long time in the face of bitter opposition from the machine politicians in his own party is a tribute not only to his own ability, but also to the American spirit of democracy.

University of Tennessee

STANLEY J. FOLMSBEE

South Carolina: Economic and Social. Edited by Wilfrid H. Callcott. (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1945. Pp. vii, 239. \$2.50.)

This volume represents the collaboration of eight contributors in cataloguing the more important features of South Carolina's contemporary social and economic conditions. The topics, together with the authors, are: Natural Resources, by James T. Penny; Population, by Julian J. Petty; Manufacturing Industries, by S. M. Derrick; Income and Savings, by George McCutchen; Agriculture, by Alfred G. Smith, Sr.; State Governmental Organization, by George R. Sherrill; Public Education, by J. McT. Daniel; Public Welfare, by George Croft Williams.

Dr. Penny deals adequately with the state's resource base. Dr. Petty's discussion of population trends and prospects is illuminating. The proportion of whites in the population is increasing, due to the heavy out-movement of Negroes, and is much larger in the cities than in the country districts. The median age of the population was 22.2 in 1940, as compared with 29 for the country as a whole. The state had 451 children 5-14 years of age for each thousand adults 20-64 years of age, as compared with 224 for New York State and 290 for the United States as a whole.

This fact should be kept in mind in reading Dr. Daniel's discussion of public education. His report reveals an impressive record of progress since 1907, when the first high school law was passed. The study also measures the enormous disparity between educational opportunities for whites and Negroes, as well as the steady narrowing of the gap. Though the American ideal of equal educational opportunity is still a long way from being realized,

it is no small accomplishment to have increased the per capita appropriation for the minority while that of the majority was going down.

Dr. Derrick's study shows that South Carolina is still too much a one crop, one industry state. Cotton is still king. Diversification, however, is setting in and industrialization goes ahead more rapidly than in the country as a whole. The new industries are predominantly the low value added, low wage industries. This fact, plus the heavy concentration of effort in the extractive industries, accounts for the state's extremely low income position.

Professor McCutchen measures income and savings and concludes that at war's end the state will have a larger supply than ever before of skilled and semi-skilled workers and liquid assets which in combination might provide the basis for a further and wholesome industrial advance. Mr. Smith, a practical farmer, urges diversification and a more balanced farm program. He utters a timely warning against recent speculative advances in land prices and the disastrous effects that may be expected. Finally, he notes that "agriculture in South Carolina has been helped immensely by the textile mills in the state." Dr. Sherill presents a useful account of the state governmental organization.

The authors have brought together the latest information about the state in a form that should prove very useful to everyone concerned with the welfare of the people of South Carolina.

This is the first volume to be issued by the University of South Carolina Press. According to the editor, "the work was done during the summer and fall of 1944 in spite of the fact that no vacation period was available and with the understanding that all expenses connected with the acquisition of the material had to be borne by the men themselves. . . . The writers were notified in advance that the studies were planned as a public service and that all proceeds from the sale of the volume would be placed in a revolving fund for the purpose of publishing further studies of importance to the State."

The reviewer would like to pay his respects to the devotion of the authors. He cannot help wondering, however, regarding the wisdom of developing another university press. Is not this tendency to multiply inadequately financed institutions one of our troubles in the South? Although his own institution has done the same thing, he suspects that southern scholarship and southern research would be better served if an arrangement could be made with one or another of the older university presses of the South to service our publications by establishing special series. With two or three strong regional joint universities presses we could all save money and at the same time build up organizations that would assure wider circulation of our literary and scientific efforts.

Vanderbilt University

JOHN V. VAN SICKLE

Historical News and Notices

A word of appreciation is due to the members of the Southern Historical Association for their patient forbearance during the delay in getting our May issue into circulation. Under present conditions printing schedules must remain unpredictable; and as a possible forecast of even more serious difficulties, mention may be made of the fact that three of our exchanges inform us that they are suspending publication because of inability to obtain paper stock.

Equally serious is the sharp decline in the publication of books on historical subjects. A tabulation by *Publishers' Weekly* (July 7, 1945) shows a total of 175 books classified as "History" published during the first six months of 1945, as compared with 283 for the same period in 1944. This is a decline of 38.2 per cent, while significantly enough the total of all books showed a decrease of only 2.3 per cent. A clue to the change in publication rate of books on southern history and closely related fields may be obtained by comparing the number of books reviewed in recent issues of *The Journal of Southern History* with those appearing in 1941 or 1942.

PERSONAL

Wendell H. Stephenson, who has been on leave of absence from Louisiana State University during the past year to do research work on historical scholarship in the South, under the auspices of a grant from the General Education Board, has accepted a position at the University of Kentucky as professor of history and editor for the University Press. He will assume his new duties in September.

The eighth series of the Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures at Louisiana State University was delivered on May 7, 8, and 9, 1945, by James G. Randall, of the University of Illinois. The general theme was "Lincoln and the South," the subjects of the individual lectures being: "When Lincoln Looked South"; "Lincoln and the Southern Border"; "Design for Freedom"; and "Design for Peace."

After forty-three years of service at the University of Missouri, Jonas Viles retired in June to the position of professor emeritus of history. At a dinner given by the department of history on June 4 in honor of Professor and Mrs. Viles, he was presented with a volume of letters from former colleagues and former graduate students.

Among the historians who have been appointed to teach in the colleges for service men in England and France are the following whose interest lies in the field of southern history: Wesley M. Gewehr, of the University of Maryland, who will be director of the history division, Walter B. Posey, of Agnes Scott College, William B. Hesseltine, of the University of Wisconsin, Charles R. Wilson, of Colgate University, Richard H. Bauer, of Mary Washington College, Paul H. Clyde, of Duke University, and James B. Ranck, of Hood College.

Leaves of absence for the year 1945-1946 have been granted to the following: Richard Hofstadter, of the University of Maryland, who has been awarded an Alfred A. Knopf history fellowship to complete his book on the social and economic ideas of American political leaders; Clement Eaton, of Lafayette College, who has received a Guggenheim fellowship for a study of liberalism in the New South; E. Merton Coulter, of the University of Texas, who will return to the University of Georgia for the year; Frank Freidel, of the University of Maryland, who has entered the Navy languages program; Stuart R. Tompkins, of the University of Oklahoma, who will serve as visiting professor of history at the University of California in Los Angeles; and F. Garvin Davenport, of Transylvania College, who will be visiting professor of history at Colgate University.

Edward Tuthill, professor of history at the University of Kentucky since 1908 and head of the department since 1911, retired from active service on July 1. He is succeeded as head of the department by Thomas D. Clark, who has been the acting head during the past two years.

John F. Ramsey, assistant professor of history at the University of Alabama, who has been in Washington doing research for the Office of Strategic Services, will resume his work at the University with the beginning of the fall term.

D. D. McBrien, formerly head of the department of history at the Arkansas State Teachers College, has become the president of Henderson State Teachers College, at Arkadelphia, Arkansas.

Verton M. Queener, professor of history at Maryville College, who has been on leave of absence for the past two years, has resigned to accept a permanent appointment in the Department of Agriculture in Washington, D. C.

New appointments which have recently been made are: Leroy P. Graf, formerly of Ohio State University, to be associate professor of history at the University of Tennessee; Gordon T. Chappell, of Newberry College, to be professor of history and head of the department at Huntingdon College, Montgomery, Alabama; Preston W. Edsall, of East Carolina Teachers College, to be associate professor of history at North Carolina State College; Marvin L.

Skaggs, formerly at Campbell College, to be professor of history and head of the department of history at Greensboro College, Greensboro, North Carolina; William O. Foster, of the Georgia Military Academy, to be professor of history and head of the department at Presbyterian College, Clinton, South Carolina; George B. Carson, of Monticello College, to be assistant professor of history at the University of Kentucky; Walter V. Scholes, a doctoral graduate of the University of Michigan, to be assistant professor of history at the University of Missouri; Horace Adams, of Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical College, to be professor of history and head of the department at Arkansas State Teachers College, Conway, Arkansas; Roman J. Zorn, a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin, to be instructor in history at the University of Arkansas; Mrs. Dana Fulcher Robinson of Dayton, Ohio, to be assistant professor of history at Queens College, Charlotte, North Carolina; and Arthur S. Link, formerly at North Carolina State College, to be instructor in history at Princeton University.

Henry McGilbert Wagstaff, professor of history at the University of North Carolina, died on May 28 at the age of sixty-nine. A native of North Carolina, he was graduated from the University in 1899 and received the Ph.D. degree in history at Johns Hopkins University in 1906. He served as acting professor of history and economics at Allegheny College, Meadville, Pennsylvania, in 1906-1907, and in 1907 he became a member of the history department of the University of North Carolina, where he remained until his death. His chief field of teaching was English history, but he published several monographs on the history of North Carolina, important among them being *State Rights and Political Parties in North Carolina, 1776-1861* (1906), and *Federalism in North Carolina* (1910). He also edited *The Harris Letters* (1916), *The Papers of John Steele* (2 vols., 1924), *The James A. Graham Papers* (1928), and *Minutes of the North Carolina Manumission Society* (1934), and was a frequent contributor to historical periodicals.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

The establishment last year of the Institute of Early American History and Culture under the joint sponsorship of Colonial Williamsburg, Incorporated, and the College of William and Mary, followed in January of this year by the death of Hunter D. Farish, the director of research for Colonial Williamsburg, has brought a number of changes in the administrative organization of the co-operative enterprise. Douglas Southall Freeman has been appointed to succeed Dr. Farish as a member of the governing board of the Institute and as a member of the board of editors of the *William and Mary Quarterly*. Carl Bridenbaugh, of Brown University, now on leave of absence for service as a lieutenant commander in the Navy, has been elected director of the Institute, and expects

to assume his new position upon his release from naval service. Lester J. Cappon, associate professor at the University of Virginia and consultant in history and archives in the University Library, has accepted a position as archivist of Colonial Williamsburg and research editor in the Institute. Both Dr. Bridenbaugh and Dr. Cappon will also become part-time members of the department of history of the College of William and Mary.

The Colonial Williamsburg project for the compilation of an index of the *Virginia Gazette*, which was begun by Dr. Farish, is being continued under the direction of Dr. Cappon. He would appreciate receiving information about any copies of the *Virginia Gazette* in private hands or in institutions with which the project has not had correspondence. Wherever possible, Colonial Williamsburg desires to obtain photostats or photoprints of such copies. Because of the details in the advertisements and the news from abroad and from other colonies as well as from Virginia which appeared in this paper from 1736 to 1780, the completion of the index should be of great value to students of eighteenth century colonial history.

The Texas State Historical Association has recently issued a 100-page booklet entitled, "A Tentative List of Subjects for the Handbook of Texas," which includes a total of more than twelve thousand topics suggested for inclusion in the proposed handbook being sponsored by the Association. According to an introductory statement, this list "represents the first step in the actual materialization of the idea to produce an authoritative, comprehensive encyclopedia of Texas history, biography, and culture." The topics range from obscure place names on the one hand to such broad problems as the Texas Revolution and the annexation question on the other, and the editors invite the co-operation of all who may be interested in Texas history, anthropology, geology, folklore, and economic or institutional development in determining the nature of the final list and in the preparation of material for the volume. The project is being carried on under the general direction of Walter P. Webb, of the University of Texas, with the assistance of an advisory council of fifteen members.

At the April meeting of the board of trustees of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History, Charlotte Capers, who has been acting director of the Department since March, 1943, was elected director of the Department, effective until the return of William D. McCain, now on leave of absence for military service.

At the annual business meeting of the South Carolina Historical Society, held early in 1945, the following officers were re-elected for the ensuing year: William Way, president; James H. Easterby, John Bennett, N. B. Barnwell, and Samuel G. Stoney, vice-presidents; William M. Means, Edward Manigault, Alice R. Huger Smith, Anna W. Rutledge, Joseph I. Waring, Anne K. Greg-

orie, E. Milby Burton, Robert N. S. Whitelaw, and Mrs. John Bennett, curators; and Elizabeth H. Jervey, secretary-treasurer and librarian.

The publication committee of the Society is considering the printing of selections from the unpublished papers of James L. Petigru, a number of which are now in its possession. In order that these may be as representative as possible, the committee is seeking information concerning all extant Petigru material. It particularly desires to know whether the large collection of letters and other papers from which the late James Petigru Carson compiled his *Life, Letters, and Speeches of James Louis Petigru* (Washington, 1920) is now in existence.

The Virginia World War II History Commission, whose headquarters are at the University of Virginia Library, issued in April an eight-page folder entitled, "Your Community's War History: What Are You Doing to Preserve Its Records?" which contains proposals and suggestions for the collection and preservation of records in Virginia that should be immensely helpful for the promotion of such work in other states as well.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

Among the recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress the following, arranged in chronological order of materials, may be noted: typescript copy of the "Records of the Manor of Marcle Audleys (Hellens) Herefordshire from 1574"; four additional boxes of papers of the Biddle family of Philadelphia, 1734 to 1933; one volume of papers of John David Woelpper, 1763 to 1810; two volumes of accounts of John Norton and Sons, merchants of London and Virginia, 1764 to 1784; seventeen reels (negative and positive) of microfilms of Thomas Jefferson materials (original manuscripts in libraries of Charlottesville, Richmond, and Williamsburg, Virginia), 1769 to 1850; seventy-one additional papers of George Bancroft and Alexander Bliss, 1788 to 1901; letter from James Madison to Richard Peters, August 19, 1789; land warrant of Israel Robinson, Washington County, Georgia, August 6, 1792, and survey of October 1, 1792; negative photostats of two letters of George Washington, March 6, 1795, and March 5, 1799; one hundred and eighty-five papers of Thomas Truxtun, 1795 to 1820; forty-seven manuscripts pertaining to American commerce, China, 1805 to 1819; one volume of the "Proceedings of the Tammany Society of Washington City," August 1, 1807, to June 1, 1810; eight additional boxes of papers of Robert Green Ingersoll, 1811 to 1935; five volumes of account books and other records of papers of the American sculptor, Henry Kirke Brown, 1817 to 1857; four volumes of copies of the diplomatic correspondence (American legation, London) of Albert Gallatin and William Beach Lawrence, May 3, 1826, to February 3, 1830; nine way bills of stage coach lines from Washington, D. C., 1836 to 1837;

one hundred and eighty-four pieces, chiefly mercantile papers of Willard P. Phillips, 1837 to 1887; one hundred and fourteen pieces of papers of Wendell Phillips, 1843 to 1884; thirty-three papers of Charles Sumner, 1847 to 1874; thirty additional papers of Hamilton Fish, 1849 to 1891; seventeen boxes of the papers of Oscar Solomon Straus, *ca.* 1856 to 1926; four boxes of papers of Thomas Lake Harris, *ca.* 1858 to 1892; diary (number 13) of Bushrod W. Hunter, of Virginia, January 4 to April 25, 1861; facsimile of a letter of Abraham Lincoln to John Hanks, January 28, 1861; one-volume diary of Patrick Ryan, Union soldier, May 30, 1862, to June 3, 1865; letterpress copy book of letters from Camp Chase, Ohio, to the Judge Advocate, September 1, 1862, to June 10, 1863; additional papers of the Breckinridge family, 1863 to 1894; letter from Alexander H. Stephens to James L. Stephens, March 21, 1869; twenty-three additional papers of the John Meredith Read family, 1875 to 1901; additional papers of Booker T. Washington, 1885 to 1904; memorandum book of Charles Henry McManaway, Confederate soldier, Bedford, Virginia, *ca.* 1878 to 1896; eighteen additional papers of the Gridiron Club of Washington, D. C., 1885 to 1908; forty-one volumes of papers of Major General James Guthrie Harbord, 1886 to 1938; forty-six additional papers of Woodrow Wilson, principally letters to George Harvey, 1906 to 1925; fifty-one pieces from the papers of Emma L. George, 1915 to 1920; one volume of the papers of the Society of Guardians of Liberty, Washington, D. C., July 3, 1916, to January 23, 1917; additional papers of Mrs. James M. Helm, relating to social functions of the White House, 1942 to 1945; "Statement of I. J. Dunn of Omaha, Nebraska, with Reference to the Democratic National Convention Held at Baltimore, Md. in 1912," January 1, 1945; and two additional papers of the Richmond P. Hobson collection, including Mrs. Hobson's notes on the life of "Rear Admiral Richmond P. Hobson, United States Navy."

Important recent accessions of the Western Historical Manuscripts Collection at the University of Missouri include: the Herbert S. Hadley papers, consisting of letters, notebooks, writings, and other papers of a Missouri attorney general (1905-1909) and governor (1909-1913), who prosecuted the Standard Oil Company under the Missouri anti-trust law, and who was the Roosevelt floor leader at the Republican National Convention in 1912; the papers of Forrest C. Donnell as governor of Missouri, 1941-1945; the papers of Charles M. Hay, a Missouri lawyer, politician, and prohibition leader during the period from 1902 to 1944; the papers of William H. Hatch, former Congressman from Missouri, consisting mainly of his letters in the period from 1870 to 1887; additional letters, plans, releases, and publications of the Missouri State Council of Defense, 1941-1945; an addition to the Missouri Constitutional Convention papers, consisting of the files of the organization that carried on the campaign for the adoption of the new state constitution, 1944-1945; letters, diary,

and school records of James Love, an early Missouri educator, 1840-1847; notes and papers of Jack Harrison, a Missouri leader of the saddle horse industry, 1912-1942; letters, notes, writings, and opinions of Frank E. Atwood, a Missouri supreme court judge and political leader, 1916-1943.

A bulletin giving a list of the manuscript materials now in the Collection was published by the University in April, 1945.

Recent manuscript acquisitions of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History include: business papers of Baker and Moss, commission merchants in Natchez, Mississippi, 1839-1849; letters and business papers of Abijah and David Hunt, commission merchants of the Natchez District, 1804-1840; letters and legal documents of William McKendree Gwin, chiefly concerned with land litigation, 1856-1863; letters of Governor William C. C. Claiborne of Louisiana to Governor David Holmes of the Mississippi Territory, 1803-1813; letters of Governor John M. Stone to the Mississippi state senate, making nominations for various state appointments, 1877-1890; personal and business letters of Daniel Price Porter, Hinds County lawyer and secretary to the Mississippi state senate in 1865; papers of the Davis Land Company, a corporation formed to pay certain debts of Jefferson Davis by the sale of lands belonging to him, 1889; papers of William Priestley, Madison County merchant and justice of the peace, 1833-1899; letters of Jefferson Davis, written to J. M. Holmes, George Torrey, and John Milton, 1863-1871; letters and literary papers of Cora E. Carey, Marshall County resident, including one letter from Sherwood Bonner and eleven letters from Edward McDowell, husband of Sherwood Bonner, 1808-1909.

Acquisitions of the North Carolina Department of Archives and History include eighteen additional transfiles of the correspondence of J. Melville Broughton, governor of North Carolina, 1941-1945, received from the governor's office; and microfilms of the Rudolph-Ney manuscripts in the custody of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, throwing light upon the question as to whether Peter Stuart Ney, a North Carolina school teacher of a century ago, may possibly have been Marshal Michel Ney of France or Captain Michael Rudolph, Revolutionary army officer from Maryland.

The Maryland Historical Society has acquired a large collection of Smith family papers covering the period from 1750 to 1900, and including deeds and correspondence of Robert Smith about lands in Georgia, Kentucky, and Arkansas; papers of Samuel W. Smith concerning copper mining in Michigan; and miscellaneous letters and accounts dealing with wharves, warehouses, and real estate owned by the family in and near Baltimore.

Other recent acquisitions to the Society's manuscript collection include: Bond family papers, 1765-1866; Howard papers, among which are deeds and ac-

counts of Mrs. John Eager Howard, 1819-1864; two account books of James Carroll of "Mount Clare," 1815-1870; a manuscript visiting list of Mrs. Philip Evans Thomas, 1840-1845, showing families by streets in Baltimore; letters from Confederate soldiers to Miss Anna Hempstone, of Leesburg, Virginia, 1862-1866; additional Civil War letters of Lieutenant Noah Dixon Walker; and twenty photographs of scenes on the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad before the Civil War.

The files of Charleston newspapers, rare pamphlets, manuscripts, and other South Carolina historical materials which were put into storage at the declaration of war more than three years ago have been returned to the shelves of the Charleston Library Society and once again are open for use.

Among the services being offered to historians and genealogists by the South Caroliniana Library, of the University of South Carolina, is a Biographical Index arranged in the form of a card catalogue. Some 25,000 names of South Carolinians, of both the past and present, have already been entered, and under each name appears a list of all references to the subject thus far discovered. Less easily available materials are now being combed for additional names and further references. The Library invites the co-operation of other institutions and of individuals in advancing this work, and it will supply to anyone such information as the Index contains.

The National Archives has announced that it has available for distribution to libraries, universities, and research institutions surplus copies of printed and near-print material produced by the National Recovery Administration and received by the National Archives with the records of the Administration. This material is of exceptional value for the study of all phases of American economic conditions not only for the period of 1933-1937 but for antecedent periods as well.

One group of material deals with the "codes of fair competition," which were drawn up for various trades and industries, and includes copies of the codes, of amendments thereto, of transcripts of hearings leading to the formulation of codes and amendments, and of "code histories" and "code administration studies," which record the experience of specific industries under the codes.

Another group consists of studies and collections of economic data made in the course of research and planning activities, or—after the Schechter decision—as a part of the self-analysis and institutional autobiography undertaken by the NRA before its final dissolution. Included in this group are copies of the "Report of the President's Committee of Industrial Analysis," a summary of the work of the NRA published after its termination, and of certain more intensive studies and compilations. In the latter category are "work materials"

(studies of industrial, trade-practice, labor, legal, and NRA administrative problems), "evidence studies" (reports on specific industries, dealing with their nature, size, technology, and relationships to interstate commerce), "statistical materials" (supplements to the "evidence studies," containing basic data on pay rolls, wages and hours, sales, prices, product values, and exports and imports), "price studies" (on the price mechanism in general and on the price structure of specific commodities), and a number of miscellaneous reports of a legal, economic, and social nature bearing upon or arising out of NRA administration.

Copies of these materials or information about them may be obtained by writing to the General Reference Division of the National Archives, Washington 25, D. C. Copies will be distributed in response to requests, in so far as the supply permits, until January 1, 1946. Lists of the more important materials are also available.

The Maryland Hall of Records Commission has published an *Index to the Maryland Line in the Confederate Army, 1861-1865* (Baltimore, 1945, pp. iv, 74, \$1.00), compiled by Mrs. Louise Quarles Lewis, State Historian of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, Maryland Division.

The Tennessee Valley; A Recreation Domain, by H. Clarence Nixon, was published in June by the Institute of Research and Training in the Social Sciences, Vanderbilt University, as the ninth number of its series of papers on the contemporary South.

The study, which was done under the joint sponsorship of the Institute and the Tennessee Valley Authority, analyzes the increased recreational opportunities which have been made possible in the South through the development of the TVA program. The brochure is handsomely illustrated, and contains, also, an excellent black and white map showing the distribution of various types of recreational facilities in those portions of seven states which lie within the area affected.

The D. Van Nostrand Company, of New York, has recently published Volume I (1492-1865) of *A Short History of the American People*, by Oliver Perry Chitwood, of West Virginia University, and Frank Lawrence Owsley, of Vanderbilt University, designed for use in the introductory college course in American history. In an effort "to avoid giving such overemphasis to certain facts as would lend too great a prominence to some periods of history or to some sections of the country," more than the usual amount of space is given to the colonial period, and social, economic, and cultural interests are given the attention which they deserve. The second volume is scheduled for fall publication.

County Government in Georgia (Athens, University of Georgia Press, 1944,

pp. xi, 197, \$2.00), by Melvin Clyde Hughes, undertakes to portray "a system of county government that is in many respects unique." It traces the development of the Georgia system from colonial times to the present, describes its organization and operation, and offers suggestions for its improvement. Emphasis is placed on a need for county consolidation and an increase in state administrative control over county affairs, particularly with respect to financial administration and law enforcement.

Phases of the History of the Supreme Court of Tennessee (Johnson City, The Watauga Press, 1944, pp. 91, \$2.00), by Samuel C. Williams, is primarily a collection of biographical sketches of judges who have served as members of the court. Considerable new light is thrown upon the personalities of these men, and a concluding chapter is devoted to a brief history of the court itself. The book deserves the careful attention of all who are interested in the history of Tennessee.

Portraiture in the Virginia Historical Society (Richmond, Virginia Historical Society, 1945, pp. 176, illustrations, \$2.00 to members, and \$2.50 to non-members), with notes on the subjects and artists by Alexander W. Weddell, expands and brings down to date the earlier list of portraits belonging to the Society which was printed in 1894. The arrangement is alphabetical by names of subjects, but chronologically the range is from King James I to our own generation. Mr. Weddell's notes describe the portraits and give information concerning their painting, wherever possible; furnish an entertaining insight into the personality and activities of the subjects; and provide brief biographical sketches of the forty artists represented. While the volume is designed primarily for the members of the Society, it will prove immensely valuable for all students of Virginia history.

The Making of a Downtown Church (Richmond, The John Knox Press, 1945, pp. 526, by Wyndham B. Blanton, was written to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Second Presbyterian Church of Richmond, Virginia, but it is much more than the history of a single church. In the process of explaining the success of this church, the author presents biographical sketches of its pastors, and analyzes the broader setting of their work in the development of Presbyterianism in Richmond as well as the development of the city itself. The book is an excellent example of local history in its best form, and it will be useful to a larger group than the present membership of the church with which it deals.

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

"Maryland and Tolerance," by Harry S. Truman, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (June).

- "The Sea Coast of Maryland," by William B. Marye, *ibid.*
- "Comments on Virginia's Contribution to American Civilization," by Thomas Perkins Abernethy, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (April).
- "John Washington Settles in Virginia," by Beverley Fleet, *ibid.*
- "The Newspaper Press and the Civil War in West Virginia," by Roy Watson Curry, in *West Virginia History* (April).
- "Preservation and Restoration of Historic West Virginia," by Charles J. Milton, *ibid.*
- "Utility Regulation in North Carolina, 1891-1941; Fifty Years of History and Progress," by Annie Sabra Ramsey, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (April).
- "Eighteenth Century New Bern, A History of the Town and Craven County, 1700-1800: Part II, The Founding of New Bern," by Alonzo Thomas Dill, *ibid.*
- "James Boon, Free Negro Artisan," by John Hope Franklin, in the *Journal of Negro History* (April).
- "Samuel Gottlieb Kramsch, Schoolman and Botanist," by Howard Elkinton, in the *American-German Review* (June).
- "William Strickland and the Building of Tennessee's Capitol, 1845-1854," by Nell Savage Mahoney, in the *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* (June).
- "Joseph McMinn, Tennessee's Fourth Governor," by William E. Beard, *ibid.*
- "William Chenault, 1835-1901, One of the Founders of the Filson Club," by Jonathan T. Dorris, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (April).
- "The Career of General James Ray, Kentucky Pioneer," by Kathryn Harrod Mason, *ibid.*
- "Thomas Crittenden Cherry of Bowling Green," by Alfred L. Crabb, *ibid.*
- "The First Landowners of Frankfort, Kentucky, 1774-1790," by Willard Rouse Jillson, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (April).
- "Early Kentucky History in Madison County Circuit Court Records," by Jonathan T. Dorris, *ibid.*
- "An Unrecorded Incident of Morgan's Raid," by William M. Miller, in the *Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "'Oklahoma,' the Land of Promise," by Carl Coke Rister, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (Spring).
- "The Old North Tower and Chimes at Edmond," by Charles Evans, *ibid.*
- "Pioneer Publisher, First Daily Newspaper in Indian Territory," by Ora Eddleman Reed, *ibid.*
- "Edward Palmer's Collection in the Indian Territory, 1868," by Rogers McVaugh, *ibid.*
- "Tulsa's Water Resources—Springs and Spavinaw," by Fred S. Clinton, *ibid.*
- "Early Times along the Arkansas River," by Louise Morse Whitham, *ibid.*

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

- "Unpublished Letter of the First Lord Baltimore," by Matthew Page Andrews, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (June).
- "Civilian Defense in Baltimore, 1814-1815," concluded, edited by William D. Hoyt, Jr., *ibid.*
- "Hand-List of Miniatures in the Collections of the Maryland Historical Society," by Anna Wells Rutledge, *ibid.*
- "A Frenchman Visits Norfolk, Fredericksburg, and Orange County, 1816," edited by L. G. Moffatt and J. M. Carrière, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (April).
- "Self-Portrait: Eliza Custis, 1808," edited by William D. Hoyt, Jr., *ibid.*
- "A Frenchman's Note on Certain Lands in Virginia," edited by David Lee Clark, *ibid.*
- "West Virginians in the American Revolution," continued, edited by Ross B. Johnston, in *West Virginia History* (April).
- "North Carolina Bibliography, 1943-1944," compiled by Mary Lindsay Thornton, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (April).
- "Life of Alfred Mordecai in Mexico in 1865-1866, as Told in His Letters to His Family," edited by James A. Padgett, *ibid.*
- "Record of Commissions of Officers in the Tennessee Militia, 1809," continued, compiled by Mrs. John Trotwood Moore, in the *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* (June).

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "Calhoun on Government," by Luther W. Courtney, in the *Furman University Studies* (May).
- "Sale and Application of Commercial Fertilizers in the South Atlantic States to 1900," by Rosser H. Taylor, *ibid.*
- "The South Carolina Dispensary System," by Ellen Alexander Hendricks, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (April).
- "General Hardee and the Atlanta Campaign," by Robert D. Little, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (March).
- "The Bulow Plantation, 1821-1835," by Ruth D. Wilson, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "Pioneer Florida: The Pan-Gaud at Pensacola in 1830," by T. Frederick Davis, *ibid.*
- "A History of the English Theatre at New Orleans, 1806-1842," continued, by Nelle Smither, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "The Semicolon Court of Texas," by George E. Shelley, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "The Bonfoey Case at Marshall," by Howard T. Dimick, *ibid.*

- "Life of General Don Manuel de Mier y Teran as it Affected Texas-Mexican Relations," concluded, by Ohland Morton, *ibid.*
- "New Braunfels, 1845-1945," by Selma Metzenthin Raunick, in the *American-German Review* (June).
- "Efforts to Finance the Aguayo Expedition: A Study in Frontier Fiscal Administration in New Spain," by Charmion Shelby, in the *Hispanic American Historical Review* (February).

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "A Provisional Guide to Manuscripts in the South Carolina Historical Society," continued, by Helen G. McCormack, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (April).
- "The Memoirs of Frederick Adolphus Porcher," continued, edited by Samuel Gaillard Stoney, *ibid.*
- "Minutes of the Vestry of St. Stephen's Parish, South Carolina, 1754-1873," continued, edited by Anne Allston Porcher, *ibid.*
- "Journal of General Peter Horry," continued, *ibid.*
- "Marriage and Death Notices from the City Gazette of Charleston, S. C.," continued, contributed by Elizabeth H. Jervey, *ibid.*
- "Letters of Henry Clay to John MacPherson Berrien," edited by Lowry Axley, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (March).
- "Contemporaneous Reactions to Statehood," in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "A New Letter of James Monroe on the Cession of Florida," edited by Rembert W. Patrick, *ibid.*
- "Index to the Spanish Judicial Records of Louisiana," continued, by Laura L. Porteous, with marginal notes by Walter Prichard, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "An Original Letter from Pork Bayou, Arkansas, April 16, 1815," edited by Dorsey D. Jones, in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (June).
- "Check List of Texas Imprints, 1846-1876," continued, edited by Ernest W. Winkler, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (April).
- "Dr. John Sibley and the Louisiana-Texas Frontier, 1803-1814," continued, edited by Julia Kathryn Garrett, *ibid.*

GENERAL AND REGIONAL ARTICLES, DOCUMENTS, AND COMPILATIONS

- "Chaplains in the American Revolution," by Charles H. Metzger, in the *Catholic Historical Review* (April).
- "The Plantation Overseer and Southern Nationalism as Revealed in the Career of Garland D. Harmon," by James C. Bonner, in *Agricultural History* (January).

- "Itinerant Merchandising in the Ante-bellum South," by Lewis E. Atherton in the *Bulletin of the Business Historical Society* (April).
- "Sources of Abolitionist Income," by Benjamin Quarles, in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (June).
- "American Slavery as Seen by British Visitors, 1836-1860," by Max Berger, in the *Journal of Negro History* (April).
- "The Upgrading of the Negro's Status by Supreme Court Decision," by Raymond Pace Alexander, *ibid.*
- "Two Civil War Voices on the Assassination of Lincoln," by Theodore Schreiber, in the *American-German Review* (April).
- "The Bristow Presidential Boom of 1876," by E. Bruce Thompson, in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (June).
- "Thomas Donaldson on the Materials of History—1846: An Early Advocate of Newspapers as Sources," edited by William D. Hoyt, Jr., *ibid.*
- "George Fitzhugh and the Theory of American Conservatism," by Arnaud B. Leavelle and Thomas I. Cook, in the *Journal of Politics* (May).
- "Jefferson's Thirteenth Amendment," by Charles Hall Davis, in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (April).
- "A Yankee Professor in the South," by Howard O. Brogan, in the *South Atlantic Quarterly* (April).
- "Southern Common Folk after the Civil War," by Thomas D. Clark, *ibid.*
- "A Post Mortem on the Labor-Safety-Valve Theory," by Fred A. Shannon, in *Agricultural History* (January).
- "The Traits and Contributions of Frederick Jackson Turner," by Ulrich Bonnell Phillips, with notes by Everett E. Edwards, *ibid.*
- "The Concept of the Frontier, 1871-1898; Comments on a Select List of Source Documents," by Fulmer Mood, *ibid.*
- "Trends in Southern Wage Differentials since 1890," by Richard A. Lester, in the *Southern Economic Journal* (April).
- "The Territorial Papers of the United States," by Clarence E. Carter, in the *American Archivist* (April).

CONTRIBUTORS

KENNETH M. STAMPP is associate professor of history at the University of Maryland.

WILLIAM W. JEFFRIES, Lieutenant, U.S.N.R., is a member of the staff of the department of English, history, and government at the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis.

T. HARRY WILLIAMS is associate professor of history at Louisiana State University.

JAMES C. BONNER is professor of history and chairman of the social science division at Georgia State College for Women, Milledgeville.

THOMAS P. MARTIN is assistant chief of the Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress.

FLETCHER M. GREEN is professor of history at the University of North Carolina.

THE HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

*A quarterly circulated widely in Latin America and the
United States containing articles, inedited documents,
book reviews, minor notices, and professional news.*

MANAGING EDITOR: JAMES FERGUSON KING

BOARD OF EDITORS

Arthur S. Aiton	Roland D. Hussey
Carlos E. Castañeda	James F. King
Charles C. Griffin	Irving A. Leonard
Lewis Hanke	Arthur P. Whitaker
Roscoe R. Hill	

ADVISORY EDITORS

Herbert E. Bolton	Dana G. Munro
Isaac J. Cox	J. Fred Rippy
Clarence H. Haring	William S. Robertson

Editorial correspondence: PROFESSOR JAMES F. KING
ROOM 439, BANCROFT LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY 4, CALIFORNIA

Business correspondence: DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS
COLLEGE STATION
DURHAM, N. C.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$4.00 A YEAR
SPECIAL RATES TO GRADUATE STUDENTS

VIRGINIA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Organized 1831 — Chartered 1834

ALEXANDER W. WEDDELL, PRESIDENT

Publishers of the

VIRGINIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

The July, 1945, issue contains the following:

*Exemption from Military Service in the Old Dominion during the
War of the Revolution*, by Arthur J. Alexander.

The "Affair near James Island," by Charles E. Hatch, Jr.

*A Frenchman Visits Norfolk, Fredericksburg, and Orange County,
1816*, by J. G. Moffatt and J. M. Carriere.

A Survey of Stafford County Records, by George H. S. King.

Book Reviews

Genealogies

Notes

MEMBERSHIPS: Life, \$100.00; Annual Sustaining, \$50.00;
Annual Supporting, \$25.00; Annual, \$5.00

Magazine sent without additional charge to members

The Lee House, 707 East Franklin St.
RICHMOND 19, VIRGINIA

Editor and Corresponding Sec y.
CLAYTON TORRENCE



THE TEXAS STATE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

1897—*The Oldest Learned Society in Texas*—1897

Offers in THE SOUTHWESTERN HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

Articles, documents, comments, news notes, and book reviews
dealing with Texas and the Southwest

Managing Editor

WALTER PRESCOTT WEBB

Associate Editors

CHARLES W. HACKETT

RUDOLPH L. BIESELE

H. BAILEY CARROLL

Subscription rate: \$3.00 per year

Correspondence relating to contributions and subscriptions should be
addressed to the Managing Editor, University Station, Austin, Texas.

The Association also publishes

THE JUNIOR HISTORIAN

A literary and historical magazine by and for young people of
Junior High, Senior High, and Lower College levels. The first
magazine in America for young people also written almost
exclusively by them.

Editor

H. BAILEY CARROLL

Subscription rate: \$1.00 per school year.

Correspondence relating to *The Junior Historian* should be
addressed to the Editor, University Station, Austin, Texas.

THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION



PRESIDENT

FLETCHER M. GREEN, University of North Carolina

VICE-PRESIDENT

ELLA LONN, Goucher College

SECRETARY-TREASURER

JAMES W. PATTON, North Carolina State College

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(In addition to the officers named above)

EX-PRESIDENTS

(For three years following expiration of their terms)

ALBERT B. MOORE, University of Alabama (1945)

J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON, University of North Carolina (1946)

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University (1947)

MANAGING EDITOR

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY, Vanderbilt University

ELECTED MEMBERS

WILLIAM G. BEAN, Washington and Lee University (1945)

JENNINGS B. SANDERS, Memphis State College (1945)

LYNN M. CASE, Louisiana State University (1946)

RALPH B. FLANDERS, New York University (1946)

J. WINSTON COLEMAN, Jr., Lexington, Kentucky (1947)

HENRY T. SHANKS, Birmingham-Southern College (1947)